

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel

Kauhanen, Tuukka

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht
2012

Kauhanen , T 2012 , The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel . De Septuaginta
Investigationes , no. 3 , Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht , Göttingen .

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/217491>

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Tuukka Kauhanen

The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel

Preface

This monograph is a revised version of my doctoral thesis, submitted to the Faculty of Theology at the University of Helsinki in March 2011. Of those several scholars who have helped me to get through this work I wish to thank my supervisor, Professor Anneli Aejmelaesus, who has meticulously read all parts of this study and offered innumerable comments that have contributed to the work immensely. Thanks are also due to Professors Raija Sollamo and Martti Nissinen as well as to the members of the Helsinki Septuagint group: Marketta Liljeström, Elina Perttilä, Christian Seppänen, Raimund Wirth, Jessi Orpana, and Miika Tucker.

Special thanks go to Prof. Jan Joosten and Prof. Eugene Ulrich who were the official reviewers of the doctoral thesis. Their comments and suggestions advanced the work significantly. I have also had valuable feedback from the following scholars: Prof. Anna Kharanauli, Prof. Andres Piquer, Prof. Pablo Torijano, Prof. Julio Trebolle, Dr. Reinhart Ceulemans, Dr. T. M. Law, and Dr. Georg Walser.

Finally, I wish to thank the Textual Criticism of the Septuagint Project, funded by the Academy of Finland, for the chance to prepare my thesis as a project researcher during the years 2005–2006 and 2009–2010. I also wish to thank the Finnish Cultural Foundation for three generous grants that have made it possible to continue the work during the years 2007–2009 and 2010–2011.

Dr. Robert Whiting has meticulously revised the English of this volume. He has also provided several helpful comments on the content. For any remaining mistakes I am solely responsible.

Tuukka Kauhanen
December 2011
Helsinki

Preface	2
Grouping of the Septuagint Manuscripts for 1 Samuel	6
1 Introduction	7
1.1 The Proto-Lucianic Question.....	7
1.2 History of Research on the Lucianic Text.....	8
1.2.1 The Point of Departure	8
1.2.2 The Overall Nature of the <i>L</i> -group.....	9
1.2.3 The Theory of the Proto-Lucianic Recension.....	14
1.3 The Purpose and Methodology of the Present Study.....	18
1.3.1 Outline.....	18
1.3.2 Principles for the Text-critical Analysis	18
1.3.3 Using the Evidence of Josephus and Patristic Writers.....	20
1.3.4 Using Latin Witnesses	22
1.3.5 Some Notes on Terminology	22
1.4 Attestation to the Lucianic Text	23
2 Josephus.....	26
2.1 Prolegomena	26
2.2 Analysis	31
2.3 Conclusion	37
3 Hippolytus	39
3.1 Prolegomena	39
3.2 Analysis	42
3.3 Conclusion	53
4 Irenaeus	56
4.1 Prolegomena	56
4.2 Analysis	61
4.2.1 <i>Against Heresies</i> 4,17,1 = 1 Sam 15:22.....	61
4.2.2 <i>Against Heresies</i> 4,26,4 = 1 Sam 12:2b–5.....	66
4.3 Conclusion	79
5 Tertullian	82
5.1 Prolegomena	82
5.2 Analysis	83
5.2.1 <i>De Jejunio</i> 9,7 = 1 Sam 1:11	83
5.2.2 <i>Against Marcion</i> 4,14,5–6 = 1 Sam 2:8.....	84

5.2.3 <i>De Jejunio</i> 10,11 = 1 Sam 14:24–25	89
5.2.4 <i>Against Marcion</i> 2,24,1 = 1 Sam 15:11	91
5.2.5 <i>De Fuga in Persecutione</i> 2,7 = 1 Sam 16:14	93
5.2.6 <i>Against Marcion</i> 2,24,7 = 1 Sam 15:28–29	96
5.2.7 <i>De Jejunio</i> 7,1 = 1 Sam 7:10	103
5.3 Conclusion	104
6 Cyprian	107
6.1 Prolegomena	107
6.2 Analysis	108
6.2.1 <i>De Dominica Oratione</i> 5 = 1 Sam 1:13	108
6.2.2 <i>Ad Fortunatum</i> 4 / <i>Testimonia</i> 3,28 = 1 Sam 2:25 ..	109
6.2.3 <i>Testimonia</i> 1,17 = 1 Sam 2:35–36	111
6.2.4 <i>Testimonia</i> 3,56 = 1 Sam 16:7	121
6.2.5 <i>Testimonia</i> 3,32 = 21:5(4)	122
6.3 Conclusion	126
7 Origen	128
7.1 Prolegomena	128
7.2 Analysis (<i>Selecta in Psalmos</i> 33 = 1 Sam 21:1–6)	129
8 The Old Latin Version	133
8.1 Prolegomena	133
8.2 Analysis (La ¹¹⁵)	136
8.2.1 Reading has Changed from Belsheim to Fischer et al.	137
8.2.2 Apparent or Coincidental Agreements between La ¹¹⁵ and L	138
8.2.3 La ¹¹⁵ Agrees with L in an Early Variant	145
8.2.4 La ¹¹⁵ and L Agree in the Original Reading	149
8.2.5 La ¹¹⁵ Possibly Agrees with L in a Recensional Reading	152
8.3 Conclusion	157
9 The Qumran Texts of 1 Samuel	159
9.1 Prolegomena	159
9.2 Analysis	160
9.2.1 The Character of 4QSam ^a	160
9.2.2 Suggested Agreements between 4QSam ^a and L	163
9.2.3 The Character of 4QSam ^b	178
9.2.4 Suggested agreements between 4QSam ^b and L	178
9.3 Conclusion	180
10 Text-historical Conclusions	183

Appendix A: Hippolytus' Quotations from 1 Samuel in <i>De David et Goliath</i>	186
Appendix B: The Average Character Width in 4QSam ^b	204
Abbreviations	205
Non-Patristic Witnesses and Text-critical Signs	205
Greek Christian Authors	206
Latin Christian Authors.....	208
Greek and Latin Classics.....	212
Secondary sources.....	214
Bibliography	217
Editions, Translations, and Reference Works	217
Studies	222
Commentaries.....	232

Grouping of the Septuagint Manuscripts for 1 Samuel

The edition of 1 Samuel for the Göttingen series¹ is being edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus for whose Project for the Textual Criticism of the Septuagint I have worked. I have had the opportunity to consult the collation books of 1 Samuel prepared by the Göttingen *Septuaginta-Unternehmen*, as well as other preliminary material of the edition, including the preliminary grouping of the MSS. It is my aim to keep the sigla used in this study compatible with the forthcoming edition as far as possible.

Uncials: A B M V

Fragments: 842 (contains 23:28–24:2; 24:6–8, 12–13, 18–20) 845 (13:16–18, 20–21; 13:23–14:1, 3–4; 18:8–25) 846 (24:11–17; 24:20–25:20; 31:12–fin) 867 (4:6, 9, 13, 15–16)

O: 247-376

L: 19-82-93-108-127

19': 19-108

CI: 98-(243)-379-731

98': 98-379

CII: 46-52-236-242-313-328-530

46': 46-52

242': 242-328

C': *CI* + *CII*

a: 119-527-799

b: 121-509

d: 44-68-74-106-107-120-122-125-134-(370)-610

68': 68-122

f: 56-246

s: 64-92-130-314-381-488-489-(762)

64': 64-381

488': 488-489

Manuscripts without grouping: 29 55 71 158 244 245 318 (342) 460 554 707

¹ *Septuaginta: Vetus testamentum graecum. Auctoritate Academiae scientiarum Göttingensis editum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931–) = Göttingen.

1 Introduction

1.1 The Proto-Lucianic Question

The textual history of the Greek Old Testament or the Septuagint (LXX) is fascinatingly complex. In addition to the normal corruption that takes place in the transmission of all ancient texts, the text of the LXX has undergone several revisions or *recensions*. In the First book of Samuel² there are three major textual traditions. The *B-text* has traditionally been identified with “the Old Greek” (OG).³ It is represented by codex Vaticanus (B), minuscules 121 and 509, and the Ethiopic daughter version (Aeth). The *Hexaplaric text* derives from Origen’s text-critical work, the Hexapla. Origen compared the LXX text at his disposal with the Hebrew text. Whenever the Hebrew text included a reading that was not present in the LXX, he added the reading, taking it from the later Greek versions (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion), and marked it with an asterisk. The readings that were present in the LXX but not in the Hebrew text he marked with an obelos. As scribes copied the LXX text of the Hexapla, they often failed to include Origen’s text-critical marks and/or misunderstood them. Eventually this resulted in a distinct text form. This text form, however, is not found in a pure form in any MS of 1 Samuel since none of the witnesses provides a direct copy from the LXX column of the Hexapla. A considerable number of its readings, however, are preserved in codex Alexandrinus (A) and MSS 247 and 376. The third major textual tradition is commonly called the *Lucianic* (or *Antiochian*) *text* because it is supposed to originate with a revision of the text by the martyr Lucian of Antioch (d. 311/312 CE). In the Historical Books this textual tradition is found in the MS group *L*⁴ and the biblical quotations of the Antiochene church fathers.

The scholarly consensus is that there are at least two strata in the Lucianic text: the recensional elements, which date back to at about 300 CE, and the substratum under these recensional elements, the *proto-Lucianic text*. The recensional elements are distinguishable to some degree since the comparison between MS group *L* and the other textual traditions reveals some tendencies that are easy to attribute to the reviser. However, some distinctive readings in *L* must have been present already in the substratum since they also seem to be supported by witnesses that antedate the supposed time of the recension by several hundred years, namely the Old Latin version (OL) and the biblical text

² In the LXX, 1–2 Sam and 1–2 Kgs form one block, βασιλειῶν Α΄–Δ΄; for this reason, many studies refer to 1 Sam of the LXX as 1 Reigns or 1 Kingdoms.

³ The term means the oldest Greek form of any book of the Old Testament.

⁴ 19-82-93-108-127 = *L*; the group is often referred to by the Brooke-McLean sigla of the MSS: boc₂e₂.

used by Josephus, Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian. It has also been posited that some *L*-readings might go back to Hebrew readings that are not found in the Masoretic text (MT) but appear in the Qumran biblical texts. This phenomenon – distinctive readings of a textual tradition that has undergone a recension appearing in witnesses that are too early to have been touched by the same recension – constitutes the proto-Lucianic problem.

The present study deals with the proto-Lucianic problem in 1 Samuel. The task is to analyze the textual material that antedates 300 CE and contains agreements with *L* against B and/or the rest of the witnesses.

1.2 History of Research on the Lucianic Text

1.2.1 The Point of Departure

The scholarly discussion on the proto-Lucianic problem cannot be viewed in isolation, but must be seen in the broader context of Septuagint studies. The related topics are the discussion on the nature of the Lucianic text and the other textual traditions as well as the overall textual history of the LXX in general and the methodology of textual criticism of the LXX and the Hebrew Bible.

In the recent presentations of the history of research, some conclusions are seen as having gained scholarly consensus.⁵ These may be taken as starting points of the present study.

- 1 The existing witnesses of the LXX text of 1 Samuel go back to a single original translation that was made in the first or second century BCE. This makes it meaningful to speak of the “original text” (the OG) of the translation.
- 2 The OG translation was made on the basis of a Hebrew text⁶ that contained many readings that diverge from the MT and was in some readings closer to the original Hebrew text than the MT.
- 3 The MSS 19, 82, 93, 108, and 127 (*L*) form a homogenous group or family that in the Historical Books attests a distinctive textual tradition. It is characterized by readings more in accordance with good Greek style and the requirements of context and parallel passages, as well as a considerable number of Hexaplaric corrections according to the Hebrew text.
- 4 The text of *L* consists of at least two strata, of which the latest results from recensional activity that aimed at improving the style, language, and readability of the text. The same or some later layer contains multiple Hexaplaric readings.

⁵ E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d rev. ed; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 136–7, 148. A. Aejmelaeus, “The Septuagint of 1 Samuel”, in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (CBET 50; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 123–7; B. Taylor, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns* (HSM 50–51; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 11.

⁶ Referred to as the *Vorlage* of the LXX.

The following subsections introduce and comment upon the discussion that has led to the above conclusions. Many excellent state-of-the-question articles have been written in the past,⁷ and this allows the following survey to concentrate on the matters that are most important regarding the proto-Lucianic problem.

1.2.2 The Overall Nature of the *L*-group

The existence of a unique textual tradition in MS group *L* was noticed already by the 19th-century scholars O. Thenius,⁸ A. M. Ceriani,⁹ J. Wellhausen,¹⁰ and F. Field.¹¹ On the basis of testimonies by ancient writers,¹² Paul de Lagarde assumed that there were three recensions of the original LXX text (*trifaria varietas*): Hesychian, Hexaplaric, and Lucianic. The OG could be reconstructed by first reconstructing and then comparing these three recensional texts. As a preliminary work he attempted to reconstruct the earliest form of the Lucianic text in his *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum*.¹³

That some distinctive readings of the *L*-group existed before the fourth century and are thus *pre-Lucianic* (antedating the historical Lucian) was already suggested by Wellhausen.¹⁴ A. Mez¹⁵ attempted to distinguish these pre-Lucianic readings in the biblical references of Josephus and C. Vercellone¹⁶ in the Old Latin version (see chapters 2 and 8).

After Lagarde, the next analysis of the Lucianic witnesses was the impres-

⁷ B.M. Metzger, "The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible", in *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (NTTS 4; Leiden: Brill, 1963), 7–14; S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 157–71; idem, *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays* (Library of Biblical Studies; New York: Ktav, 1974), xxxiv–xxxvii; G. Howard, "The Septuagint: A Review of Recent Studies", *ResQ* 13 (1970), 158–63; E. Tov, "The State of the Question: Problems and Proposed Solutions", in R.A. Kraft (ed.), *1972 Proceedings for IOSCS and the SBL Pseudepigrapha Seminar* (SBLSCS 2; Missoula, 1972), 8–9 (with a bibliography, pp. 13–15); E. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 15–37; Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 32–8; J.-H. Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königsbücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1–19,9* (BZAW 394; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 7–32.

⁸ O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuelis* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1842).

⁹ A. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher: Septuaginta-Studien 3* (2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965 [1st ed. 1911]), 49 n. 1, 80 n. 1, refers to Ceriani's *Monumenta sacra et profana* (1863) and *Le edizioni e i manoscritti delle versioni siriane del V.T.* (1869/1870).

¹⁰ J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1871).

¹¹ F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum vetus testamentum fragmenta* (vol. 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1867), lxxxvii.

¹² See Metzger, "The Lucianic Recension", 3–7.

¹³ P. de Lagarde, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum: pars prior* (Gottingae: Arnoldi Hoyer, 1883). On the limitations of Lagarde's work, see Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 24–30.

¹⁴ Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 221–4.

¹⁵ A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus: Untersucht für Buch V-VII der Archäologie* (Basel: Jaeger & Kober, 1895).

¹⁶ C. Vercellone, *Variae Lectiones Vulgatae Latinae Bibliorum editionis*, vol. 2 (Rome, 1864).

sive work on the Books of Kings by Alfred Rahlfs. Rahlfs demonstrated that there are not any simple criteria to make a distinction between the recensional *L*-readings and the readings already present in the base text of the recension. The overall nature of the recension is equally difficult to describe. Rahlfs preferred to use the term ‘tendency’ to describe the recensional features. These tendencies include: making the language sound like better Greek, harmonizing some details in the text according to the context, and sporadic corrections towards some Hebrew tradition – mainly to the so-called proto-Masoretic text.¹⁷ According to Rahlfs, the base text was an old, pre-Hexaplaric text close to the type attested in B and the Ethiopian daughter version.¹⁸ Rahlfs was the first to show that the old picture of a threefold textual history of the LXX is not all that clear. However, more recently several scholars have suggested that Rahlfs’ “lagardian point of view”¹⁹ made him undervalue the importance of the pre-Lucianic readings.²⁰ Rahlfs utilized the biblical quotations of early church fathers as important pre-Lucianic witnesses, an approach followed later by Bonifatius Fischer and Sebastian Brock (see chapters 4–6).

The scholarly view of the textual history of the Historical Books was revolutionized by the discovery of the Nahal Hever Minor Prophets scroll (8HevXIIgr)²¹ and the subsequent identification of the *καίγε* recension by Dominique Barthélemy.²² Having noted that the text of 8HevXIIgr contained a Hebraizing recension, Barthélemy found the same recensional features especially in the LXX of Lamentations and in the B-text of Judges and parts of the Books of Kingdoms (so-called *καίγε* sections: 2 Sam 11:2 – 1 Kgs 2:11, 1 Kgs 22 – 2 Kgs). Barthélemy’s well-known thesis was that in the *καίγε* sections of Kingdoms the Old Greek translation is actually preserved in *L*. From this point of view, Barthélemy attempted to demonstrate that *L* gives the text closest to the OG in other sections of the Books of Kingdoms as well. He explained the secondary features of this text as assimilation to the Hexaplaric text.²³

¹⁷ Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 291–4.

¹⁸ Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 290–1.

¹⁹ J.R. Busto Saiz, “The Antiochene Text in 2 Samuel 22”, in L. Greenspoon/O. Munnich (ed.), *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Paris 1992* (SBLSCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 131.

²⁰ Ibid.; similarly E. Tov, “Lucian and Proto-Lucian: Toward a New Solution of the Problem”, *RB* 79 (1972), 101 following P.L. Hedley, “The Göttingen Investigation and Edition of the Septuagint”, *HTR* 26 (1933), 69.

²¹ The latest edition is by E. Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

²² D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila: première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophète trouvés dans le désert de Juda* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

²³ Ibid., 33–41; 91–2; 126–7. For the impact of Barthélemy’s work as well as a list of reviews see R.A. Kraft, “Reassessing the Impact of Barthélemy’s Devanciers, Forty Years Later”, *BIOSCS* 37 (2004), 1. For responses to Barthélemy, see esp. S.P. Brock, “Lucian Redivivus: Some Reflections on Barthélemy’s Les Devanciers d'Aquila”, in *Studia Evangelica* 5 (TU 103; 1968).

Major criticism of Barthélemy began in the following year with Frank Moore Cross's article in the *Harvard Theological Review*.²⁴ Cross's investigations on the Qumran biblical scrolls showed that the oldest Hebrew witnesses contain readings that seem to agree with the Greek *L*-readings. This led him to conclude that even the proto-Lucianic layer is a recensional text.²⁵ Emanuel Tov joined in the criticism. He pointed out especially that Barthélemy dismissed the evidence of the cases in which *L* gives a more literal equivalent of the Hebrew text than the *καίγε* recension. Moreover, strong internal evidence in *L* proves that this text is also of recensional origin, even in the *καίγε* sections (see also p.16).²⁶

Sebastian Brock's dissertation in 1966 is the most thorough study of the recensions of 1 Samuel thus far.²⁷ Brock's conclusion is that the textual line that *L* is based on diverged from the rest of the tradition at a comparatively early date, perhaps first century CE. This means that all the distinctive *L*-readings are not necessarily due to the recensional activity of Lucian, but to an otherwise lost independent textual tradition antedating him. Brock has also noted the most striking recensional features in *L*: "correcting" the gender of some nouns, interchange of first and second aorist endings and of aorist middle and passive, adding the definite article, using a participle to avoid parataxis, and removal of the historic present.²⁸

Although Brock's work remained unpublished until 1996, it has greatly influenced the subsequent study of the recensions in the Historical Books.²⁹ This can be seen especially in recent Spanish contributions to LXX studies, published in the series *Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros»*, which contains "monographs that are both preparatory and complementary to the edition of the biblical text as such."³⁰ An important contribution in that series is the edition of the Lucianic text. As a preliminary work, Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz edited Theodoret's *Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena*.³¹ The editors confirmed the great agreement between Theodoret's citations and the Lucianic (in their terms 'Antiochene') text of Samuel-Kings. The edition,

²⁴ F.M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert", *HTR* 57 (1964): 281–99.

²⁵ Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text", 292–7. Barthélemy responded in a prepublished paper for the 1972 symposium of the IOSCS: "A Reexamination of the Textual Problems in 2 Sam 11:2 –1 Kings 2:11 in the Light of Certain Criticism of Les Devanciers d'Aquila", in R.A. Kraft (ed.), *1972 Proceedings: Septuagint and Pseudepigrapha Seminars* (SBLSCS 2; Missoula: SBL, 1972), 16–89.

²⁶ Tov, "Lucian", 102.

²⁷ Published thirty years later: S.P. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel* (Quaderni di Henoch 9; Turin: Silvio Zamorani, 1996).

²⁸ Brock, *Recensions*, 297–8, 225–51.

²⁹ See N. Fernández Marcos, "Prólogo" to Brock, *Recensions*, 9*–11*.

³⁰ N. Fernández Marcos, "On the Present State of Septuagint Research in Spain", in N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea: V Congreso de la IOSCS* (Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 34; Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano", 1985), 273.

³¹ N. Fernández Marcos/J.R. Busto Saiz, *Theodoret's Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena: editio critica* (Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 32; Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano", 1984) = *Tht 1 Reg.*

El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega (= Ant), saw the light in 1989.³²

In a paper at the sixth congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) Fernández Marcos put forward an appeal for greater concentration on the literary aspects of the Lucianic text. In his view, Rahlfs emphasized the double readings and Brock the syntactical and lexical variants, while he himself sees different kinds of narrative harmonizations as the major recensional feature. These include:

1. Completing the unsaid in the prediction-fulfilment scheme.
2. Adding small sentences to clarify the narrative or smooth some ruptures. These additions are not usually taken from parallel passages – if such exist – nor are they double translations.
3. Stylistic rewriting, including the elimination of Semitisms typical of translation Greek.
4. Corrections of theological or midrashic character.
5. Double readings, which may be further classified as those
 - a. composed of translation plus transliteration of the same Hebrew word,
 - b. based on different vocalization of the Hebrew, and
 - c. alternative readings based on a different consonantal text.³³

The overall nature of *L* in 1 Samuel has been investigated by Bernard A. Taylor in his dissertation in 1989, published a little later as a two-volume work *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns*. Taylor's conclusion is that *L* is a witness to an archetype that was redacted, but the redaction "is not complete, and/or has been reharmonized towards the majority text."³⁴ Taylor maintains that his study supports the scholarly acceptance of B as *the* representative of OG and calls for reconsidering the positions of Barthélemy and Cross (see next section, p. 14) with regard to the relationship of the proto-Lucianic text and the OG.³⁵ This is, however, little more than a necessary consequence of his presupposition that for 1 Samuel "MS B is the best witness to, and lies close to, the Old Greek."³⁶ Contrary to Tov, Taylor rejects the possibility of seeing the Lucianic text as *an* Old Greek text (see p. 16). Taylor does not take a position regarding the value of proto-Lucianic readings in general.³⁷

³² N. Fernández Marcos/J.R. Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega* (3 vols; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1989–1996).

³³ N. Fernández Marcos, "Literary and Editorial Features of the Antiochian Text in Kings", in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 292–8. See also idem, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 230–2.

³⁴ Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 96.

³⁵ Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 127.

³⁶ Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 6. This is said to be proved by the lack of Hexaplaric material in B (ibid., 7).

³⁷ Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 53–4. The second part of Taylor's work consists of an edition of the majority text of the Lucianic MSS of 1 Samuel. See also idem, "The Lucianic Text of 1 Reigns: The Three Texts Compared and Contrasted", *BIOSCS* 29 (1996): 53–66.

While 1 Samuel belongs to Barthélemy's non-καίγε section, recent studies show that it has not totally escaped early Hebraizing correction. This correction worked with the same principles as the καίγε recension, but was much more sporadic. This type of correction is visible in the majority of the witnesses, including B, but not in *L*.³⁸ This observation further points to the conclusion that the textual tradition that *L* is based on deviated from the other traditions at an early date.

There are still some questions relating to the overall nature of *L* which have so far drawn little attention. These include the exact place of the Hexaplaric material in *L*: Does it belong to the first recensional layer that made the stylistic polishing or is it a later development of the text?³⁹ At least some of the Hexaplaric readings in *L* seem to be early since they are attested by Antiochian church fathers, e.g., the plus καὶ παρώργιζεν αὐτήν ἢ ἀντίζηλος αὐτῆς καὶ γε παροργισμῷ διὰ τὸ ἐξουθενεῖν αὐτήν in 1:6 is attested by John Chrysostom (d. 407 CE). However, improving the style and the language of the text and bringing it closer to the Hebrew text are at least partly opposite goals, since the Hebraizing readings often have Semitisms and other features of non-literary Greek.

The most recent advocate of Barthélemy's theory is Siegfried Kreuzer. In short, he maintains that *L* as a whole is very close to the OG and the differences between the witnesses result mostly from the activity of the καίγε recension.⁴⁰ Kreuzer's approach is at least partly founded on some results of previous studies that my study calls into question. Kreuzer pleads that "[w]e have to take seriously the insight that the Lucianic/Antiochene text has many agreements with Josephus and with the Old Latin translation and often is confirmed by the Qumran Samuel texts."⁴¹ However, it will be seen in the course of the present study that, at least in 1 Samuel, the testimony of the witnesses mentioned is at best ambiguous (Qumran Samuel texts: see the next section and chapter 9;

³⁸ See the examples in A. Aejmelaeus, "A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek – Deconstructing the Textus Receptus", in A. Voitila/J. Jokiranta (ed.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008).

³⁹ I had the opportunity to discuss this matter with the late Udo Quast in Göttingen in the summer of 2005. He told me that his studies in the Octateuch had suggested that there was constant development in the Lucianic text. Quast termed this ongoing development "the Lucianic School."

⁴⁰ S. Kreuzer, "Towards the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (Especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and Kaige Recension)", in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SBLSCS 55; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 251; idem, "Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, Kaige, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns", *BIOSCS* 42 (2009), 43–4.

⁴¹ Kreuzer, "Towards the Old Greek", 252. So also idem, "Translation", 39: "It is not only the agreements with Josephus and the OL version that show there is an old component in the Lucianic text, but the Qumran texts even more ... These witnesses support the Lucianic text in many cases, which makes it clear that it has an old component that is close to the OG."

Josephus: chapter 2; the OL: chapter 8). Similar theories have been put forward by one of Kreuzer's doctoral students, Kim Jong-Hoon.⁴²

1.2.3 The Theory of the Proto-Lucianic Recension

While Barthélemy suggested that *L* might not be a recensional text at all (see above), Cross suggested that there is a recension already in the substratum of *L*. The development of this theory and the critical reactions and alternative views to it deserve to be recounted at some length.

The most important – at least, from the point of view of a biblical scholar – archaeological discovery of the 20th century is the Qumran finds. Among them, fragments of three scrolls of the Books of Samuel were discovered in the late summer of 1952 from Qumran cave 4 (4QSam^{a-c}).⁴³ When Cross published the first fragments of 4QSam^a, he stressed the agreements between these fragments and the LXX. Cross concluded that 4QSam^a is a witness to the same textual tradition as the *Vorlage* of the LXX.⁴⁴ This analysis led Cross to adopt the “Local texts theory”: The Masoretic text, the LXX, and the Qumran biblical texts reflect different local textual traditions.⁴⁵ The agreements between 4QSam^a and *L* are due to a “proto-Lucianic recension” made on the basis of the OG towards a Hebrew text like 4QSam^a in the second or first century BCE.⁴⁶

In his dissertation in 1978, Eugene Ulrich attempted to demonstrate the connection between the textual traditions of 4QSam^a and *L* in 1 Samuel. The connection cannot be due to the recensional layer, since a Hebrew text similar to 4QSam^a would have been unavailable to Lucian. This means that the connection must be between 4QSam^a and the proto-Lucianic layer.⁴⁷ Because the proto-Lucianic layer is not a translation in its own right, its conformity with 4QSam^a must be due to a revision of it toward this type of Hebrew text (“the text tradition in contemporary Palestine”). Ulrich suggested that this revisional

⁴² Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen*. I have assessed Kreuzer's theory at more length in a joint article with T.M. Law: T.M. Law/T. Kauhanen, “Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer”, *BIOSCS* 43 (2010): 73–87.

⁴³ For modern introductions to the Qumran biblical texts see, e.g., Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 101–17; E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

⁴⁴ F.M. Cross, “A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint”, *BASOR* 132 (1953), 23.

⁴⁵ According to Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3; Jerusalem: Simor, 1981), 256, n. 9, the theory originates with H.M. Wiener and W.F. Albright. Tov refers to H.M. Wiener, “The Pentateuchal Text: A Reply to Dr. Skinner”, *BSac* 71 (1914): 218–268 and W.F. Albright, “New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible”, *BASOR* 140 (1955), 27–33 (repr. in F.M. Cross/S. Talmon [ed.], *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975], 140–6). More recently, the theory of local texts has found an advocate in Shemaryahu Talmon: see Talmon, “The Textual Study of the Bible – A New Outlook”, in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 321–400.

⁴⁶ Cross, “The History of the Biblical Text”, 295–6.

⁴⁷ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 15.

work should be termed “a series of proto-Lucianic revisions,” rather than *the* proto-Lucianic recension.⁴⁸

Another of Cross’s students, James Donald Shenkel, refined the theory slightly. According to him, the proto-Lucianic recension is chronologically a second stage in the development of the Lucianic text. He stated that the three earliest text forms (the other two being the OG and the *καίγε* recension) “correspond to the principal local types of the pre-Masoretic Hebrew text.”⁴⁹ The earliest stratum of the Lucianic text is, according to Shenkel, an ancient text dating to the first centuries BCE, while the second stratum consists of additions by means of which the earlier stratum was brought into partial conformity with the Hexaplaric text.⁵⁰

Fernández Marcos is one of the present advocates of the theory of the proto-Lucianic recension. An interesting thought in Fernández Marcos’ work is that all doublets are not necessarily recensional elements, nor secondary readings at all. Many of them could go back to an alternative Hebrew reading.⁵¹ Richard J. Saley, one of Cross’s co-editors in the DJD series, seems to have become doubtful about the close relationship of 4QSam^a and *L* – this is suggested by his recent articles in *BIOSCS*.⁵² For example, regarding the doublets in *L*, Saley concludes: “[T]here is not a close correlation between the Greek Lucianic doublets and 4QSam^a... . Whatever the source(s) for the Greek Lucianic doublets in the Books of Samuel, the evidence at hand does not support an origin in a text akin to that of 4QSam^a.”⁵³

The theory of the proto-Lucianic recension has been under constant criticism. In his dissertation, Brock expressed reservations about it and offered conclusions of his own. A couple of quotations from his summary conclusions

⁴⁸ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 258–9.

⁴⁹ J.D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM 1; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), 5.

⁵⁰ Shenkel, *Chronology*, 8. This stratification is used also by N. Fernández Marcos, “A Greek-Hebrew Index of the Antiochene Text”, in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Oslo, 1998* (SBLSCS 51; Atlanta: SBL, 2001), 309. In addition to Shenkel, Tov (*Text-Critical Use*, 256 n. 10) lists the following scholars as developers of Cross’ theories: R.W. Klein, “Studies in the Greek Texts of the Chronicler” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1966); idem, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: From the Septuagint to Qumran* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974); J.D. Purvis, *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968); K.G. O’Connell, *The Theodotianic Revision of the Book of Exodus: A Contribution to the Study of the Early History of the Transmission of the Old Testament in Greek* (HSM 3; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972); J.G. Janzen, *Studies in the text of Jeremiah* (HSM 6; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973); J.C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977); and Ulrich, *Qumran Text*. At this point could also be mentioned the rather vague idea put forth by George Howard (“The Septuagint”, 163) that the proto-Lucianic stratum was a “revision of *καίγε* in favour of a Hebrew Vorlage like the texts presented by the Qumran Scrolls”, rather than vice versa as Cross and Barthélemy had suggested.

⁵¹ Fernández Marcos, “On the Present State”, 283. See also idem, *Septuagint*, 235–6.

⁵² R.J. Saley, “Greek Lucianic Doublets and 4QSam^a”, *BIOSCS* 40 (2007): 63–73; idem, “Proto-Lucian and 4QSam^a”, *BIOSCS* 41 (2008): 34–45. See my references to some of Saley’s analyses of the readings in section 9.2.2.

⁵³ Saley, “Greek Lucianic Doublets”, 73.

are in order:

While it is indeed possible that Cross' 'Proto-Lucianic' recension, based on the 'Palestinian' Hebrew text, did exist for 1 Kms, the evidence adduced so far is not decisive, and is capable of other explanations.⁵⁴

The text of *L* in fact contains at least three different strata of approximations: first, non-hexaplaric. [*sic*] which are probably, but not certainly, early; second, hexaplaric in the narrow sense of readings deriving from the fifth column; and third, readings excerpted from the other columns of the hexapla. The attribution of individual approximation, when not attested by *O/D* [*D* \approx *d* 554], to any one of these strata is often difficult.⁵⁵

The textual tradition behind *L* had split off from that behind LXX *rell* at an early date, and so underwent several centuries of more or less independent development before it reached its present form, c.300 AD. Thus its text contains many early variants lost to the rest of the LXX tradition, and – most important – a number of original readings, again otherwise lost.⁵⁶

Tov denies the existence of a proto-Lucianic recension. In his article in *Revue Biblique* in 1972, Tov suggested "a new solution of the problem": The substratum of Lucianic recension contains "either *the* Old Greek translation or any Old Greek translation."⁵⁷ Tov offers his "working hypothesis" as a compromise between the views of Barthélemy and Cross (see above). According to Tov, the sources reflecting Lucianic and even proto-Lucianic readings are so numerous that all of them could not have been retouched by Lucianic revisers. Even some post-Lucianic sources may be independent of the recension and reflect the ancient substratum, or, indeed, the OG.⁵⁸

Tov admits that it is not easy to define criteria for distinguishing the three layers of *L*: the OG, Hexaplaric approximations (which Tov attributes to Lucian), and Lucian's own corrections. This difficulty is because all the phenomena of adding and changing for syntactical or contextual reasons are seen in the first stratum of the recension as well.⁵⁹ Tov suggests that the investigation should start with pinpointing those readings in which proto-Lucianic elements reflect early variants. Consequently, certain "typologically similar readings" without additional evidence might be pre-Lucianic as well. Another line of investigation should attempt to pinpoint the Hexaplaric readings in *L*. The

⁵⁴ Brock, *Recensions*, 303.

⁵⁵ Brock, *Recensions*, 305. "Approximation" is Brock's term for a reading that has been changed to bring it to better conformity with the Hebrew text. Using the term allows one to avoid the ambiguous term 'correction'.

⁵⁶ Brock, *Recensions*, 306.

⁵⁷ Tov, "Lucian", 103.

⁵⁸ Tov, "Lucian", 103.

⁵⁹ Similarly B. Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten in der Vetus-Latina der vier Königsbücher", *Studia Anselmiana* 27/28 (1951), 175–6, who takes into account the possibility that the stylistic changes attributed to Lucian may have been present already in the earlier text stratum. This is shown by the fact that the Old Latin translation (see chapter 8) is now and then "more Lucianic than *L*."

changes that Lucian himself introduced (the third layer) have been studied quite extensively already.⁶⁰

Regarding the relationship between *L* and the other MSS in the non-καίγε sections, Tov suggests that we should continue to characterise the other MSS as the OG, but offers two alternatives when the *L*-reading deviates from the rest of the MSS: 1. In the non-καίγε sections the substratum of *L* “always represents the Old Greek, while the other MSS *as a rule* reflect the Old Greek, but *at times* their text has been retouched.” 2. Both of the readings “represent two parallel Old Greek traditions.”⁶¹

Tov has also written a lengthy comment on Ulrich’s dissertation (see above). Tov admits that there are some important agreements between 4QSam^a and *L*. He, however, suggests caution in evaluating the agreements, and that it is the agreement between 4QSam^a and *L* that “must probably be ascribed to the changes inserted by the historical Lucian.” Tov also claims that Ulrich focused on the *agreements* between 4QSam^a and *L*, while the *disagreements* between the two have been disregarded. Tov’s own investigations have shown that such disagreements must be taken into consideration because they make the agreements between 4QSam^a and *L* seem even weaker.⁶²

In her paper at the 8th congress of the IOSCS, Aejmelaeus rejected the hypothesis of a proto-Lucianic recension: it “is a hypothesis created to fit another hypothesis, the neat pattern of the theory of local texts, but without any practical significance.” According to Aejmelaeus, the early Jewish Hebraizing corrections were more probably done towards a Hebrew text very similar to the MT. The same circles that eventually accepted the proto-Masoretic text as authoritative were the ones responsible for the early corrections. This sporadic correction in the main line of textual transmission and the possibility of inner-Greek corruptions are sufficient explanations for the phenomena on which the theory of the proto-Lucianic recension has been based.⁶³

Cross’s theory has also been rejected by Edward D. Herbert. Herbert examines briefly the suggested agreements between 4QSam^a and *L* against both the MT and the B-text in secondary readings (relying on Kyle McCarter’s assessments of the readings). There are actually only two of these (1 Sam 5:10, 6:2; see p. 167), and Herbert dismisses them as not convincing enough to establish a relationship between the witnesses.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Tov, “Lucian”, 107–108. The last point is especially true now after nearly four decades.

⁶¹ Tov, “Lucian”, 109. Tov’s views have remained essentially the same; see Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 148.

⁶² E. Tov, “The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam^a”, JSOT 14 (1979), 43–4.

⁶³ Aejmelaeus, “The Septuagint of 1 Samuel”, 126.

⁶⁴ E.D. Herbert, “4QSam^a and its Relationship to the LXX: an Exploration in Stemmatalogical Analysis”, in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SBLSCS 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 46.

1.3 The Purpose and Methodology of the Present Study

1.3.1 Outline

The discussion concerning the nature of the pre-Lucianic readings has been concentrated on the theory of the proto-Lucianic recension. No attempts to analyze thoroughly the pre-Lucianic textual data have been made since Brock,⁶⁵ although already in 1972 Tov called for studies on “the nature and quantity of pre-Lucianic elements in boc_2e_2 [= *L*].”⁶⁶ This is the topic of the present study: to throw light on the proto-Lucianic problem by assessing the text-historical relationships between *L* and the (possibly) pre-Lucianic witnesses for the text of 1 Samuel.

The witnesses are dealt with roughly in the same order as they have been brought into the discussion in the history of research. The testimony of Josephus will be dealt with briefly in chapter 2. Chapters 3–7 deal with the quotations from 1 Samuel by Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen. The quotations of these five early church fathers form the most substantial part of the allegedly proto-Lucianic textual material. Therefore their text-historical affinities are subjected to a more extensive analysis, taking into account the quotations in their broader textual and historical context. Most emphasis, however, will be given to the agreements between these witnesses and *L*. The OL version, especially the MS La¹¹⁵, will be dealt with in chapter 8. Chapter 9 deals with the Qumran Samuel text. Each of the eight analysis chapters ends with a brief concluding section and in chapter 10 the overall conclusions regarding the proto-Lucianic problem in 1 Samuel are given.

1.3.2 Principles for the Text-critical Analysis

The first one to establish stabile criteria in the form of text-critical *canons* was Paul de Lagarde. According to the first of his canons, the existing MSS of the LXX are eclectic and therefore the reconstructing of the original requires an eclectic method as well. Knowledge of the style of the translators is the most important tool in this process. The second and third canons instruct the analyst to prefer the reading that represents a freer rendering compared to a more slavish one, and the one that least corresponds to the MT.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ An exception is V. Spottorno’s (“The Lucianic Text of Kings in the New Testament”, in C.E. Cox [ed.], *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* [SBLSCS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991]: 279–84) attempt to show that some quotations from Samuel-Kings in the NT could preserve proto-Lucianic readings. The question is beyond the scope of the present study since there are no explicit quotations from 1 Samuel in the NT.

⁶⁶ Tov, “State of the Question”, 9.

⁶⁷ The reference is to Driver’s English translation: S.R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), xliv.

The two extreme opposite positions concerning the relationship of B and L are that the reading of B is *always* superior to that of the Lucianic witnesses (Taylor is not far from saying that), and vice versa (as Barthélemy in *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*). Both of these extremities should be avoided. Therefore, even if Taylor's presupposed preference for B⁶⁸ was still understandable in the late 1980's, by now the scholarly world should have awoken to see that there are obvious Hebraizing corrections in B.⁶⁹

When analyzing the variation units,⁷⁰ Taylor expresses more than once his reservation towards Rahlfs' rejection of the "*lectio difficilior*" of B in favor of the Lucianic reading that is closer to the MT. He considers these occasions (see vv. 24:1, 31:12 in Taylor's chapter 3) as deviances from Lagarde's rule to favor the variant less in accordance with the Hebrew.⁷¹ What vindicates a reading, however, is not the "difficulty" from the scholar's point of view, nor the discordance with the MT; it is its ability to explain the existence of the other readings.⁷² Thus the most important question is "what happened to the text?" This is emphasized especially by Anneli Aejmelaes:

[T]he primary criterion for text-critical decisions is the probability of what happened, the probability of the development of the alternative readings from the supposed original. For instance, if *a* and *b* are alternative readings in a certain case, the emergence of *b* out of *a*, if *a* is the original, and the emergence of *a* out of *b*, if *b* is the original, are often two completely different stories, and the actual decision to be made concerns which one of these stories more probably represents what really happened.⁷³

The internal criteria of the textual analysis of the LXX are not limited to the question of accordance or discordance with any Hebrew tradition. A reading becomes all the more trustworthy if it is in accordance with the contemporary κοινή Greek usage and, most importantly, the translation technique⁷⁴ of the

⁶⁸ Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 6; see p. 6 above.

⁶⁹ See the examples in Aejmelaes, "Kingdom at Stake."

⁷⁰ *Variation unit* is a term that Eldon Jay Epp has suggested. It is defined as "*that segment of text, constituting a normal and proper grammatical combination, where our manuscripts present at least two 'variants'.*" (Emphasis his.) Although Epp is discussing NT textual criticism, the definition can be applied to LXX textual criticism as well. E.J. Epp, "Toward the Clarification of the Term 'Textual Variant'", in J.K. Elliot (ed.), *Studies in New Testament Language and Text* (NovTSup 44; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 172.

⁷¹ Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 62, 63.

⁷² See, e.g., A. Aejmelaes, "Licence to Kill? Deut 13:10 and the Prerequisites of Textual Criticism", in *On the Trail*, 181–204; see also K.H. Jobes/M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2000), 130. In NT scholarship, the Alands (see K. Aland/B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987], 275–6) have stressed the importance of this criterion.

⁷³ "Corruption or Correction? Textual Development in the MT of 1 Samuel 1" in P. Torijano Morales/A. Piquer Otero (ed.), *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls: Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera: Florilegium Complutense* (SJSJ 157; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012).

⁷⁴ On the definition of the term and the principles of translation technical studies see Raija Sollamo, "Translation Technique as a Method", in H. Ausloos et al. (ed.), *Translating a Translation: The LXX and its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 35–41.

original translator. Translation technique has been a somewhat neglected area in textual criticism because of the problems relating to its use. To make a study of the translation technique exact would presuppose the reconstruction of both the Hebrew *Vorlage* and the exact wording of the original translation. The reconstruction of the *Vorlage*, however, is not possible without the reconstruction of the original translation, which itself is not possible without acquaintance with the translation technique and the *Vorlage*. None of these three factors (the Hebrew *Vorlage*, the original translation, and the translation technique) stands without the others and so it is not possible to study one of them in isolation, nor all of them in subsequent phases. They must be studied complementarily correcting one factor constantly with the others.⁷⁵

1.3.3 Using the Evidence of Josephus and Patristic Writers

There are five major problems in using the quotations of Josephus and the early church fathers as witnesses for the Bible text: 1. the nature of the quotation, 2. linguistic preferences of the author, 3. possible influence of the OL translation(s) behind Latin quotations, 4. problems relating to translation from Greek to Latin or Georgian and Armenian, and 5. possible contamination from biblical MSS in the transmission of the church fathers' works.

1. The nature of the quotation needs to be taken into account before using the quotation as a textual witness. Criteria for identifying reliable quotations have been set especially by NT textual critics, most recently by Carroll D. Osburn.⁷⁶ He defines five categories for the classification of quotations:

Citation. A verbally exact quotation, whether it corresponds entirely (for very brief instances) or largely (for longer instances), and whether made from a text or from memory, often having an introduction and always having an explicit or implicit cue to the reader that it is intended as a deliberate citation.

Adaptation. A quotation from a recognizable text, often without an introductory formula, in which much of the lexical and syntactical structure of the text is preserved and woven unobtrusively into the patristic context, reflecting intent to cite, but which is adapted to the patristic context and/or syntax in less important portions of the text.

Allusion. A reference to the content of a certain biblical passage in which some verbal or motif correspondence is present, but reflecting intent to give only the gist of the text rather than to cite.

Reminiscence. A clear reference to a particular biblical text, but lacking significant verbal content and reflecting no intent to cite; an echo of a biblical text that has little or no sustained verbal correspondence to the text.

⁷⁵ A. Aejmelaesus, "What Can We Know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint", in *On the Trail*, 72–3.

⁷⁶ C.D. Osburn, "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism", in *NovT* 47:4 (2005): 313–43.

Locution. The use of biblical language in a more general way that cannot be identified with a specific text.⁷⁷

In view of the special nature of Josephus' biblical references (see chapter 2), Osburn's categories could be expanded with a category *paraphrase*, which can be seen as a special case between Osburn's *allusion* and *reminiscence*. In a *paraphrase* the writer intends to reproduce most of the content of the passage (rather than just the "gist" as in *allusion*) but in his own words. It is more than "an echo" (as in *reminiscence*) but still "has little or no sustained verbal correspondence to the text."

The reading of a quotation is naturally most trustworthy if the quotation can be classified as a *citation*. In the case of an *adaptation*, parts of the text may reflect the exact wording of a Bible MS used by the father, but the needs of the context of the quotation have to be taken into account. *Allusions* and *reminiscences* may be useful in evaluating whether the author knew some passage or not, occasionally even which lexical variant most likely lies behind his reading, but extreme caution should be exercised.

2. Often text-critical studies pay little or no attention to the linguistic preferences of the church fathers or the translators of their work. However, the linguistic preferences of the author are an important aspect, especially in considering possible Greek readings underlying the quotations by the Latin authors Tertullian and Cyprian and in the Latin translation of Irenaeus' *Against Heresies*. For Irenaeus there is a Latin-Greek index⁷⁸, but for Tertullian and Cyprian one has to resort to handiwork with biblical concordances and Scripture indexes.⁷⁹ Gathering data in this way is, however, time-consuming and this consideration is given thorough attention only when serious doubt could be raised concerning the Greek word underlying a certain Latin word.⁸⁰

3. In case of the Latin fathers Tertullian and Cyprian as well as the Latin translation of Irenaeus' *Against Heresies*, the author or the Latin translator may have translated the biblical quotations himself or utilized an existing OL Bible. In the latter case the quotation would not be a direct witness to the Greek text but to the OL translation. In order to control this factor, the father's readings must be compared with all the available material that may witness the OL. This will be done in chapters 4–6.

4. Of the early witnesses for the proto-Lucianic text of 1 Samuel, only Josephus' and Origen's works are available in the original Greek. The greater part of Irenaeus' *Against Heresies* survives only in Latin and Armenian, and Hippo-

⁷⁷ Osburn, "Methodology", 318.

⁷⁸ The second volume of B. Reynders (ed.), *Lexique comparé du texte grec et des versions latine, arménienne et syriaque de l' "Adversus haereses" de Saint Irénée I–II. Introduction. Index des mots grecs, arméniens et syriaques* (CSCO 141–142: Subsidia, tome 5–6; Louvain, 1963).

⁷⁹ The standard indexes for Tertullian (G. Claesson, *Index Tertullianus* [3 vols.; Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1974–1975]) and Cyprian (*Thesaurus Sancti Cypriani* [Corpus Christianorum / Thesaurus Patrum Latinorum; Turnhout: Brepols, 1997]) do not contain Latin-Greek indexes.

⁸⁰ I have treated this topic in a paper at the 14th Congress of the IOSCS in Helsinki in July 2010 under the title "Using Patristic Evidence: a Methodology in the Textual Criticism of the LXX."

lytus' *De David et Goliath* in Georgian and Armenian translations. Often the requirements of the target language or the preferred usage of the translator make an agreement seem doubtful.

5. The biblical quotations in the fathers' texts are very liable to contamination from the Bible text familiar to the copyists. Especially when a Hebraizing reading attested by the chief Hexaplaric witnesses is found in the text of an early church father, careful consideration must be given to the possibility that it is a Hexaplaric reading that has intruded into the transmission of the father's work.

1.3.4 Using Latin Witnesses

Although the Latin language is theoretically able to reproduce almost every linguistic detail of a Greek original, in practice totally slavish translations are rarely found. Ulrich reminds us that it is important to make a "distinction between what the Latin language is able to reflect theoretically and what in practice the individual translator did reflect."⁸¹ This critical judgment of the nature of the translation must always precede the analysis of the readings. In addition to Ulrich's article referred to above, two important studies deal with the differences of the two languages from the point of view of using Latin witnesses in the textual criticism of the Greek text: Sven Lundström's *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der Christlichen Latinität*⁸² and Bonifatius Fischer's article "Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache,"⁸³ handily available in an English translation in Bruce M. Metzger's excellent *The Early Versions of the New Testament*.⁸⁴ These studies will be referred to in several instances in the chapters dealing with Latin witnesses.

1.3.5 Some Notes on Terminology

A number of terms need clarification.

Pre-Lucianic. A witness or a reading that antedates the *floruit* of the historical Lucian, i.e., 300 CE.

The proto-Lucianic text. The text used as the base text of the Lucianic recension.

⁸¹ Ulrich, "Characteristics and Limitations of the Old Latin Translation of the Septuagint", in idem, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 283 (original print in N. Fernández Marcos [ed.], *La Septuaginta*, 67–80).

⁸² S. Lundström, *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der Christlichen Latinität* (Lund: Gleerup, 1955).

⁸³ In K. Aland (ed.), *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionen* (ANTF 5; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972).

⁸⁴ B. Fischer, "Limitations of Latin in Representing Greek", in B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 362–74.

A proto-Lucianic reading. A reading appearing in the Lucianic text tradition which is: 1. in variation to B and/or the majority of the MSS and 2. supported by at least one *pre-Lucianic* witness.

Agreements between the witnesses are classified as follows:

1. *Apparent agreements.* The agreement is limited to phenomena that depend on linguistic and contextual variables and is therefore only apparent and must be disregarded when studying the relationship between the witnesses. E.g., the Tertullian-reading *voce magna* in 1 Sam 7:10 corresponds to the *L*-reading φωνῇ μεγάλῃ in not having a preposition, but it may reflect the *B*-reading ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ as well (see p. 104).
2. *True agreements* can be further divided into:
 - a. *Coincidental agreements.* The witnesses in all likelihood attest the same reading, but that does not imply any identity of origin. E.g., in 1 Sam 16:7 Cyprian omits the second occurrence of the verb ὁψεται/*videt* with two Lucianic (19-108) and a couple of other MSS, but this is coincidental since the predicate is not needed and Cyprian uses the quotation only as a short proverb out of context (see p. 121).
 - b. *Indisputable agreements.* Linguistic and contextual considerations very strongly point to a common origin of the reading.

1.4 Attestation to the Lucianic Text

For exact data of the MSS the reader should consult Rahlfs' *Verzeichnis*.⁸⁵ Bibliographical and paleographical data are given here only for the principal Lucianic MSS.

The group *L* consists of the following MSS:⁸⁶

- 19 (Rome, the library of Prince Chigi, R. VI. 38) is a 12th-century parchment containing the Octateuch as well as 1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Chronicles, 1–2 Esdras, Judith, Esther, and 1–3 Maccabees.
- 82 (Paris, National Library, the Coislain collection, 3) is a 12th-century parchment containing the Octateuch and Kingdoms. The MS has probably been copied from a defective MS, and it looks like it had been completed with a non-Lucianic manuscript in 1 Sam 31:3–10.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ A. Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* (MSU 2; Berlin: Weidmann, 1914); idem, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments. Bd. I, 1: Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (ed. Detlef Fraenkel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

⁸⁶ Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis* (1914), 277, 184, 113–14, 248, 144.

⁸⁷ J.R. Busto Saiz, "On the Lucianic manuscripts in 1–2 Kings", in C.E. Cox (ed.), *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem, 1986* (SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 305. According to Brock, *Recensions*, 18, the non-Lucianic section in 82 is 1 Sam 30:30–31:11.

- 93 (London, British Museum, Royal 1 D. II) is sometimes called “codex Arundelianus” according to its 17th century location at Arundel, West Sussex. It was written on parchment in the 13th century and it contains Ruth, Kingdoms, Chronicles, 1–2 Esdras, Esther, 1–3 Maccabees, and Isaiah.
- 108 (Rome, The Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 330) is dated to the 13th century and is written on paper. It has a passage numbering with Greek, Old Slavonic, and Old Armenian signs. The MS contains the Octateuch, Kingdoms, Chronicles, 1–2 Esdras, Iudith, and Esther (and Tobit in another hand). There are multiple Hexaplaric marginal notes. According to Vercellone this was the principal MS for the LXX column of the Complutensian Polyglot (Compl; this edition will be cited whenever deviating from MS 108). This MS very often goes together with MS 19 against the other three MSS (see below).
- 127 (Moscow, Synodal library, Gr. 31) is a 10th-century parchment containing the Octateuch, Kingdoms, and Chronicles. Genesis and a part of Exodus as well as the end of 2 Chronicles of the original MS are missing – these parts are provided in paper by a 15th-century hand with several Hexaplaric readings.

Fernández Marcos’ co-editor, Busto Saiz, has analyzed the interrelations of the MSS of *L*. He divides them into two textual groups: 19 and 108 (19’ in the Göttingen edition) and 82, 93, and 127 (*L*^{-19’}). According to Busto Saiz, *L*^{-19’} reflects better the earliest form of the recensional text because it agrees more often with the quotations of Theodoret. Because group 19’ often stands against both *L*^{-19’} and B, it is thought to “present a set of other indeterminate corruptions.” Busto Saiz also observes that *L*^{-19’} is nearer to the Hebrew text, especially in the proper nouns. It is, however, improbable that in these cases it would have been emended against the Hebrew. Group *L*^{-19’} is found to agree with B against 19’. This is “not because of contamination from Septuagint but because it [= *L*^{-19’}] keeps to the Old Greek text better.”⁸⁸ In the present study the Lucianic text is always given according to Ant. However, for each variation unit that is analyzed the complete MS evidence will be reported.

MS group *d* (see p. 6) joins *L* now and then, but in these instances the question is about Hexaplaric material shared by both textual traditions. MS group *f* (56-246) and MSS 55, 158, 318, and 554 join *L* frequently even in readings that do not seem to be Hexaplaric. They probably witness the spreading of Lucianic readings to other MS traditions.

In addition to the MSS, six Antiochene church fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries quote the OT in a distinctively Lucianic text form: Eustathius (d. before 337 CE), Asterius (d. after 341), Diodore (d. before 394), John Chrysostom (d. 407), Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428), and Theodoret (d. 458).⁸⁹

⁸⁸ Busto Saiz, “On the Lucianic manuscripts”, 305–7, 308.

⁸⁹ Brock, *Recensions*, 181–94.

T. Stockmayer collected 22 instances in 1 Samuel in which the Peshitta (Pesh) agrees with *L*. He suggested that the Lucianic recensor used the Peshitta when making the revision.⁹⁰ While modifying Stockmayer's list somewhat, Brock too argues that the most likely explanation for the coincidences is sporadic use of Pesh by the recensor.⁹¹ If that is the case, it is unlikely that any of the agreements might be proto-Lucianic. However, one reading in Brock's list (12:3 ἀποκρίθητε] εἶπατε *L* 554 Pesh) is also supported by a proto-Lucianic witness, Irenaeus. Brock considers the possibility of independence of Pesh and *L* in this reading, but notes that "Irenaeus' support rules out Lucian himself as being the source of at least this Pe reading in *L*."⁹² The variation unit is dealt with at length in chapter 4 (see p. 71 onwards).

The Syrohexapla (Syh) by Paul of Tella and his co-workers goes back to the 7th century and therefore cannot be considered a pre-Lucianic witness. While some passages of chapters 2, 7, and 20 of the Syrohexapla of 1 Samuel have survived,⁹³ the extant material is hardly sufficient to study its relationship to *L*. Richard Saley has noted the frequent agreement between the version of Jacob of Edessa (Syr^J) and *L* – this points to the conclusion that Jacob used Greek MSS representing the Lucianic text tradition.⁹⁴

⁹⁰ T. Stockmayer, "Hat Lukian zu seiner Septuagintarevision die Peschito benützt?", *ZAW* 12 (1892), 218–23.

⁹¹ Brock, *Recensions*, 205–6, 210.

⁹² Brock, *Recensions*, 207, 210.

⁹³ See M. Liljeström, "Looking for Fragments of the Syrohexapla: The Song of Hannah in Barberiniani Orientali 2 as a Test Case?" *BIOSCS* 40 (2007), 49–61.

⁹⁴ R.J. Saley, "The Textual Vorlagen for Jacob of Edessa's Revision of the Books of Samuel", in B. ter Haar Romeny (ed.), *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of His Day* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 18; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 121. The article is based on Saley's monograph *The Samuel Manuscript of Jacob of Edessa: A Study in Its Underlying Textual Traditions* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 9; Leiden: Brill, 1998). For problems in using Syr^J in Septuagintal textual criticism, see A. Salvesen's article "Jacob of Edessa's Version of 1–2 Samuel: Its Method and Text-Critical Value" in the same volume.

2 Josephus

2.1 Prolegomena

Josephus (Jos) uses a number of Old Testament books in his historical work *Jewish Antiquities* (*Ant.*). There are several studies concerning Josephus' references to the Historical Books (or 1 Samuel in particular): Adam Mez wrote a study by the title *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V–VII der Archäologie*¹ and Rahlfs dedicated a whole chapter to Josephus in *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher*². H. St. J. Thackeray wrote a short "Note on the evidence of Josephus" in Brooke-McLean's edition of the books of Samuel, and Thackeray's monograph *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* includes a chapter on Josephus' biblical text.³ Brock treats the subject in a section in his *Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel*⁴ and in Ulrich's *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*⁵ Josephus is one of the main textual witnesses discussed. Victoria Spottorno, who has been responsible for the apparatus concerning Josephus' evidence in *Ant.*, presents some results of that work in a short article by the title "Some Remarks on Josephus' Biblical Text for 1–2Kgs."⁶ The introduction of the edition also contains a section about Josephus based on her work.⁷ Most recently, Etienne Nodet has treated the topic in his article "Josephus and the Books of Samuel" in Louis H. Feldman's *Festschrift*.⁸ These studies revolve around three major topics concerning Josephus: 1. Josephus' nature as a textual witness, 2. the relationship of Josephus' biblical references to the LXX and the MT, and 3. the textual affinities of Josephus' LXX text.⁹

¹ A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V–VII der Archäologie* (Basel, 1895).

² Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 80–111.

³ H. St. J. Thackeray, "Note on the evidence of Josephus", in Brooke-McLean 2:1, ix; idem, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1929), 75–99.

⁴ Brock, *Recensions*, 210–16.

⁵ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*.

⁶ V. Spottorno, "Some Remarks on Josephus' Biblical Text for 1–2Kgs", in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 277–85; 278.

⁷ N. Fernández Marcos/J.R. Busto Saiz, "Introducción" to *Ant* 1, xxxv–xxxviii.

⁸ E. Nodet, "Josephus and the Books of Samuel", in S.J.D. Cohen and J.J. Schwartz (ed.), *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism: Louis H. Feldman Jubilee Volume* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 67; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 141–67.

⁹ For more references to studies pertaining to Josephus' biblical text the reader should consult L.H. Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), 165–70. Feldman explicitly sides with Mez and Thackeray on many topics. Feldman's own series of articles on "Josephus' portraits" of biblical figures, including Saul, David, and Samuel, definitely needs to be mentioned even though these studies do not include text-critical discussion: Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Saul",

1. Josephus' narration in *Jewish Antiquities* is a free retelling of the biblical history. This is why the nature of the biblical references in it is very different from the quotations of the church fathers, and they are best classified as *paraphrases* (see p. 21). While this is universally recognized, Mez and Thackeray were quite optimistic about the possibility of using *Jewish Antiquities* as a witness for the Bible text: Mez was able to present 30 readings from the books of Samuel in support of his theory of Josephus' text-historical position (of which see below) and Thackeray introduces Josephus as "a witness of first-rate importance for the text of the Greek Bible."¹⁰

Ulrich and Spottorno stand somewhere between criticism and optimism. Ulrich fully acknowledges the problems involved and the existence of many "unaccountable" readings in Josephus' text but, on the other hand, he is able to present 96 readings from the books of Samuel in which Josephus can be said to agree with certain witnesses against one or more of the others – or disagree with all of them.¹¹ Spottorno investigates the "coexistence of paraphrase and fidelity to the biblical narrative" in Josephus' text. The major part of her article classifies different types of paraphrases that make Josephus' attestation uncertain.¹² "[I]t is hard to find a complete sentence coincident with the Greek bibli-

HUCA 53 (1982): 45–99; idem, "Josephus' Portrait of David", *HUCA* 60 (1989): 129–74; idem, "Josephus' Portrait of Samuel", *AbrN* 30 (1992): 103–45. A special mention must be made of Christopher T. Begg's host of articles from 1988 onwards on Josephus' account of biblical stories and persons. Even the articles pertaining to 1 Samuel are too numerous to be listed here. I have browsed through the following of them: Begg, "Samuel's Farewell Discourse according to Josephus", *SJOT* 11:1 (1997): 56–77; idem, "Saul's Royal Start according to Josephus", *SacEr* 37 (1997): 5–32; idem, "David's Second Sparing of Saul according to Josephus", *TynBul* 48:1 (1997): 93–117; idem, "David's Double Escape according to Josephus", *JPJ* 10 (1998): 28–45; idem, "David's Fourfold Escape according to Josephus", *Antonianum* 80:3 (2005): 433–52; idem, "The Youth of Samuel according to Josephus", *SacEr* 45 (2006): 15–45; idem, "David, Object of Hate and Love according to Josephus", *REJ* 166:3–4 (2007): 395–410. None of the articles so far, however, handle specifically the verses in which the supposed proto-Lucianic readings appear (see the next section). Although Begg always asks the question to what extent Josephus followed the MT, B, and/or L in a given passage, there are no actual text-critical discussions. These considerations often end merely with a statement that Josephus' narrative is closer to the LXX. Evaluations of Josephus' evidence for Greek variants or the original Hebrew reading are not given. Therefore when Begg introduces these results as addressing the "text-critical question" (e.g. Begg, "David's Fourfold Escape", 449), he is perhaps unduly extending the meaning of the term 'text-critical.'

¹⁰ Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus*, 80; Thackeray, "Note", ix.

¹¹ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 223–4, 190–1. The figure 96 is the sum of the number of readings mentioned in the conclusion of Ulrich's chapter "The Agreement of Josephus with 4QSam^{ab}" which are: 5, 34, 8, 5, 11, 17, 6, 5, 3, and 2:

*In 5 readings ... J and 4Q alone preserve archaic Samuel readings ... G explicitly joins the 4Q J alliance against M in 34 additional readings ... Eight further readings ... strengthen the case for 4Q L influence on J, where M and G diverge. In another direction ... C [= Chronicles] joins the 4Q J alliance against M G in 5 readings... . The most frequent manner in which J departs from 4Q in favor of another biblical Vorlage is in his 11 agreements with G against 4Q M ... The specifically Greek influence on J is demonstrated in 17 additional readings ... And the specifically L influence is evident in 6 further readings. J agrees with M against 4Q in 5 readings ... J agrees with C against 4Q M G in 3 solid plusses ... the two other readings involving proper names are excessively weak. (Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 190–191; emphasis mine)*

¹² Spottorno, "Some Remarks", 278–83.

cal text, but sometimes Josephus' expression is biased towards one Greek text more than to another." However, Spottorno finds about 200 readings in the books of Samuel in which she is able to decide whether Josephus is closer to "the Septuagint" or the Lucianic text.¹³ Building upon Spottorno's work Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz lay out the following conclusions: Both Josephus and the (in their terms) Antiochian recension belong to a later phase in the development of the Greek language and aim at improving the style. Therefore in many cases the contact between them might result from these common *literary* features without any text-historical contact. Instances of this kind are, however, included in calculations of agreements (see below) "without prejudging if that approximation indicates textual or literary dependence."¹⁴

Rahlfs and Brock seem to have the most skeptical view: Rahlfs dismissed some of Mez's readings from the books of Samuel as inconclusive because of the uncertainty of Josephus' attestation (and most of the readings on other grounds; see below).¹⁵ Brock follows Rahlfs in dismissing almost all of Mez's readings from 1 Samuel (preserving only Mez's no. 100 = 1 Sam 27:8). He, however, presents about ten other cases in which Josephus likely attests one or the other of several different LXX readings.¹⁶

2. The question of whether Josephus' main biblical *Vorlage* was the Hebrew Bible or the LXX is dealt with most thoroughly by Ulrich.¹⁷ He makes a very convincing case for a Greek source: a. Although Josephus' native language was Hebrew or Aramaic, he knew Greek well enough to compose several works in that language. b. The Greek OT was available in late first century Italy – Josephus may even have brought one with him. c. To use a Greek, rather than a Semitic, source was a practical choice.¹⁸ d. A survey of *Ant.* 7.78–89, which retells 2 Sam 6, reveals that in this passage there are 180 expressions "for which J is dependent on a biblical *Vorlage*" of which 56 might be based either on Hebrew or Greek. Another 56 readings "point with some probability toward a Greek *Vorlage*," for another 51 readings "there is strong indication of a Greek *Vorlage*," and 17 readings could only have emerged on the basis of the Greek text.¹⁹ This is most in line with Mez.²⁰ Rahlfs, and Brock assumed that Josephus also used a Semitic source.²¹ According to Thackeray, an exclusively Semitic source was used for the Octateuch but for the later Historical Books

¹³ Spottorno, "Some Remarks", 283.

¹⁴ Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, "Introducción", XXXVII.

¹⁵ Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 84–5, 87, 88, 89 (Mez's cases nos. LXIV, 100, 121, 145, 147, 149, 151).

¹⁶ Brock, *Recensions*, 214–16. It is not easy to give an exact figure since Brock's assessment of a given reading is not always clear; see below.

¹⁷ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 223–56.

¹⁸ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 224–6.

¹⁹ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 228–39; 239–44; 255.

²⁰ Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus*, 80.

²¹ Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 111; Brock, *Recensions*, 210–11, 212. Somewhat similarly, Spottorno, "Some Remarks", 283: "I think we should leave aside the idea that Josephus 'used' the Hebrew text, because the agreements with it are very rare and they can be explained by his knowledge (probably by heart) of the Hebrew Bible, from which he took some data at his convenience."

Josephus' used the LXX as his main source and a Semitic text only "as a collateral source".²² Nodet, however, takes Josephus' statement that he "translated" (μεθρημηνευμένην) the narratives of *Jewish Antiquities* from the Hebrew scriptures (*Ant.* 1.5) at face value (contrast Ulrich's analysis²³) and maintains that the textual evidence points to the conclusion that Josephus used a Hebrew source but different from the proto-Masoretic text form.²⁴

3. Despite the differences concerning the previous topic, all the aforementioned scholars accept that Josephus is at least partly dependent on some LXX tradition – even Nodet acknowledges that some instances "may imply that he actually glanced at a Greek Bible!"²⁵ Mez was very confident about Josephus' dependence on the Lucianic text in the Books of Samuel and Thackeray came to the very same conclusion.²⁶ Rahlfs is again more cautious: while Josephus' LXX text was not identical with *L*, his testimony proves that in a very considerable number of cases the special readings in *L* do not originate with Lucian but already existed in the first century at the latest.²⁷

Brock goes through the evidence very fast providing little analysis. He concludes that the evidence is ambiguous and gives no ground for Mez's and Thackeray's "sweeping claims": "Josephus merely confirms the impression gained elsewhere that *L* here and there has preserved old material lost to the rest of the surviving tradition."²⁸ According to Ulrich, Josephus has used "a slightly revised form of the OG" which is, in fact, the proto-Lucianic text. Ulrich also suggests that Josephus' biblical text also has a connection to 4QSam^a, but the connection is not direct but comes through the Greek proto-Lucianic text. Ulrich has at this point followed Cross's theory that the proto-Lucianic text was a revision of the OG towards a Hebrew text close to the type of 4QSam^a (see p. 14).²⁹

Spottorno's conclusion is more in line with that of Mez and Thackeray: "we can say that the agreements with the Lucianic text are more frequent than those

²² Thackeray, "Note", ix; idem, Josephus, 81.

²³ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 226–8.

²⁴ Nodet, "Josephus", 142, 166.

²⁵ Nodet, "Josephus", 151.

²⁶ Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus*, 80. Thackeray, "Note", ix; idem, Josephus, 83, 85–6.

²⁷ Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 92: "Josephus hat in den Samuelisbüchern nicht einen mit *L* fast identischen Septuaginta-Text benutzt, beweist aber in einer immerhin recht erheblichen Anzahl von Fällen, dass Sonderlesarten des *L*-Textes nicht erst von Lucian stammen, sondern mindestens schon im 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr. vorhanden gewesen sind." Concerning the Books of Kings, however, Rahlfs concludes that there Josephus attests only a modest number of *L*-readings: "Während in den Samuelisbüchern eine immerhin ganz stattliche Anzahl von Sonderlesarten des *L*-Textes, namentlich Eigennamen, bei Josephus nachzuweisen war ... ist ihre Zahl in den Königsbüchern sehr bescheiden. Josephus folgt hier in erster Linie dem hebräischen Urtext und zieht die LXX erst in zweiter Linie heran." (ibid., 111).

²⁸ Brock, *Recensions*, 216.

²⁹ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 191: "J [= Josephus] uses a slightly revised form of the OG ... but that revised form is the early stratum, pL [the proto-Lucianic text] ... J used the text of Samuel strikingly close to 4QSam^a, but ... that text was in the Greek language, closely connected with OG/pL and clearly distant from both M [= MT] and the kaige and hexaplaric recensions."

with the majority Septuagint.”³⁰ In the introduction to Ant the figures for 1–2 Samuel are given as 146 agreements between Josephus and *L* against 52 between Josephus and “LXX”. The agreement between Josephus and *L* is slightly greater in the *καίγε* sections than in the non-*καίγε* sections.³¹ The relevance of the given figures, however, is diminished by the fact that there are surely much more than about two hundred “places where the Lucianic text is distinct from Septuagint” in the books of Samuel. In order to be able to evaluate the significance of the figures it would be of primary importance to know how often Josephus’ reading is uncertain or perhaps deviates from all textual traditions of the LXX. Moreover, one should know how many of the agreements are in secondary and how many in original readings, what kind of linguistic phenomena are involved, and how many of the instances are Hebraizing approximations.³²

Although Nodet maintains that Josephus used the Bible exclusively in Hebrew, he nevertheless dedicates a section to Josephus’ relation to the Lucianic text. He, however, maintains that the “close relationship” finds an explanation in that “both eventually depend on the same Hebrew source.” Nodet even adopts the view that the earliest form of *L* was a “full-scale translation,” attributing this view to Tov.³³

On the basis of these studies the following conclusions can be taken as a starting point:

1. Because of its age *Jewish Antiquities* in all likelihood preserves valuable ancient readings, but it is often impossible to achieve certainty of the reading of Josephus’ Bible text.
2. This Bible text was most likely the LXX. However, Josephus very likely knew the texts in Hebrew as well, and has now and then provided material from the Hebrew text that is lacking in the LXX.
3. The frequent uncertainty about which reading Josephus attests makes it difficult to assess which textual tradition of the LXX Josephus’ text was closest to.

³⁰ Spottorno, “Some Remarks”, 283.

³¹ Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, “Introducción”, xxxvii–xxxviii. In the non-*καίγε* section the figures are 65 against 32 (= 67% against 33%) and in the *καίγε* section 81 against 20 (= 80% against 20%).

³² In her articles on Josephus’ text of Kings and Chronicles, Spottorno provides more detailed discussion, but the results are quite similar: Spottorno, “Josephus’ Text for 1–2 Kings (3–4 Kingdoms)”, in L. Greenspoon/O. Munnich (ed.), *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Paris 1992* (SBLSCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 145–52; idem, “The Books of Chronicles in Josephus’ Jewish Antiquities”, in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SBLSCS 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 381–90.

³³ Nodet, “Josephus”, 148, 159. Nodet quotes Tov’s “Lucian and Proto-Lucian”, 104–5, but apparently misunderstands Tov’s suggestion that “the above-mentioned [= proto-Lucianic] sources reflect elements of either the Old Greek translation or a single Old Greek translation underlying Lucian’s revision.” (Cf. p. 10.)

2.2 Analysis

Since the evidence available has already been analyzed by several scholars, it would be of little use to collate the evidence of Josephus once again. Rather, since Brock and Ulrich provide the most comprehensive *and* critical lists of readings in which Josephus and *L* seem to agree against B, I will provide an analysis of the readings in these lists. In the analysis, some words of context are provided from *Jewish Antiquities*, BHS, and Rahlfs (preceded by the verse number of 1 Samuel). A short, often simplified apparatus with the reading of Rahlfs in the lemma will follow. Finally, the source (Brock, *Recensions* or Ulrich, *Qumran Text*) is given in parentheses.

Ant. 5.339 Ἡλὶ τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ δύο παῖδες ἦσαν Ὀφνίης τε καὶ Φινεέσης. οὗτοι ...
γυναικῆς τε τὰς ἐπὶ θρησκείᾳ παραγινομένας ...

2:22 וְשָׁמַע אֶת כָּל-אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשׂוּן בָּנָיו לְכָל-יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר-יִשְׁכָּבוּן אֶת-הַנָּשִׁים הַצֹּבְאוֹת פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד
καὶ ἤκουσεν ἃ ἐποίουν οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ

Ἰσραὴλ] + πάντα καὶ ὅτι συνεκοιμῶντο οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν γυναικῶν
τῶν παρεστηκυῶν παρὰ τὰς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου³⁴ A V O L
731^{mg} 236^{mg}-313^{mg} d⁻⁶⁸ f s^{-64.130} 55 158 554 (Jos *Ant.* 5.339) = MT
(Ulrich, 185)

According to Ulrich, the note about how Eli's sons "lay with the women who served at the entrance to the tent of meeting" (NRSV) is an expansion in the MT which "found its way into G mss early enough to influence J."³⁵ Although I agree with Ulrich that Josephus' *written source* was probably the LXX (see above), he certainly had learned the story in Hebrew and may well have added the note from memory. According to Brock, the addition is Hexaplaric.³⁶ There is no need to suppose contact between Josephus and *L*.

Ant. 6.40 γινώσκετε γὰρ ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν ὑμῶν ἀποσπάσουσι τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὰ
μὲν αὐτῶν ἀρματηλάτας εἶναι κελεύσουσι ...

³⁴ This is the text of Ant; in the MSS there are several different readings that are not relevant to this discussion and therefore disregarded here.

³⁵ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 185.

³⁶ Brock, *Recensions*, 65. For an analysis of Josephus' rewriting of the passage, see Begg, "The Youth", 19–20.

8:11 וַיִּשְׁלַח יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת הַיָּדָיו עַל הָעָם וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלָיו וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלָיו
αὐτοὺς ἐν ἄρμασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἵππεῦσιν αὐτοῦ

ἐν ἄρμασιν] ἄρματηλάτας *L* (sub ast 127) *Jos Ant.* 6.40; ἐν (εἰς *V*)
ἄρματηλάτας (-λατη 379; -λατ 98) *V C' a*^{-119c} *f* 29 55 71 245 318 707
(Brock, 214)

The word ἄρματηλάτης ‘chariot-driver’ is used in the LXX only in 2 Mac-
cabees 9:4, but it is not infrequent in Greek literature.³⁷ Probably for that rea-
son, Brock suggests that Josephus’ reading is simply *ad sensum* and in the
LXX MSS the change is made in conformation with the following word: “he
will put them as chariot-drivers and cavalrymen.” As Brock concludes, the
change in Josephus, *L*, and *V C'* etc. does not need to be interdependent.³⁸

Ant. 6.51 ἄλλ’ ἦττων, εἶπεν, ἐγὼ, δέσποτα, ταύτης τῆς ἐλπίδος καὶ φυλῆς
μικροτέρας ἢ βασιλέας ποιεῖν καὶ πατριᾶς ταπεινοτέρας τῶν ἄλλων
πατριῶν.

9:21 מִן הַיָּדָיו וַיִּשְׁלַח יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת הַיָּדָיו עַל הָעָם וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלָיו וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם
σκήπτρου φυλῆς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τῆς φυλῆς τῆς ἐλαχίστης ἐξ ὅλου σκήπτρου
Βενιαμιν

σκήπτρου φυλῆς ... τῆς φυλῆς ... σκήπτρου] σκήπτρου (> *Tht* 561) ἐκ τῶν
φυλῶν ... ἡ πατριὰ μου ... πατριᾶς *L Tht I Reg.* 552 561; φυλῆς ... πατριᾶς
... πατριῶν *Jos Ant.* 6.51 (Brock, 214)

Brock states that in 1 Samuel, along with Genesis and the Twelve Prophets,
σκήπτρον corresponds to שֹׁפֶטֶט and φυλή to הִשְׁבָּט. Josephus preserves this
terminology elsewhere (*Ant.* 6.61, 227, 236) but agrees here with *L* in having
the equivalent πατριὰ for הִשְׁבָּט. However, in the LXX in general φυλή cor-
responds to שֹׁפֶטֶט. Brock suggests that this has caused confusion and motivated
the change to πατριὰ. This can be observed in *L* in 1 Sam 10:21 as well (see p.
147).³⁹ In Josephus’ texts, σκήπτρον is used only once in the meaning ‘kin,
family’ (*Ant.* 6.61); πατριὰ is the usual word (14 times).⁴⁰ In that respect the
reading πατριὰ is likely a change by Josephus to his more usual terminology
and does not need to be dependent on *L*.⁴¹

³⁷ It is attested 156 times in TLG.

³⁸ Brock, *Recensions*, 214.

³⁹ Brock, *Recensions*, 286.

⁴⁰ K.H. Rengstorf (ed.), *The Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus: Study Edition* (2 vols.;
Leiden: Brill, 2002), 2:1718 [= 4:24 in the earlier edition].

⁴¹ So Brock, *Recensions*, 214. Brock (ibid., 161) also observes the doublet with both σκήπτρον and
φυλή for שֹׁפֶטֶט. He considers φυλή secondary, and notes that *L* normally changes σκήπτρον to φυλή
consistently.

Ant. 6.53–54 Σαμουήλος ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς κοίτης ... ἐκέλευσε τὸν μὲν θεράποντα ποιῆσαι προελθεῖν, ὑπολείπεσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν-ἔχειν γὰρ αὐτῷ τι φράσαι [μηδενὸς ἄλλου παρόντος]. καὶ ὁ μὲν Σαοῦλος ἀποπέμπεται τὸν ἀκόλουθον, λαβὼν δ' ὁ προφήτης τὸ ἅγιον ἔλαιον καταχεῖ τῆς τοῦ νεανίσκου κεφαλῆς ...

9:27 וַיֹּאמֶר שָׁאוּל לְיֵהוּיָאֵל הַכֹּהֵן הַגִּדִּי אֶת-הַיָּדָיו עַל-הָאֵלֹהִים כִּי-יָבֹא אֶת-הַיָּדָיו עַל-הָאֵלֹהִים עַל-הָאֵלֹהִים εἰπόν τῷ νεανίσκῳ καὶ διελθέτω ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν καὶ σὺ στῆθι ὡς σήμερον καὶ ἄκουσον ῥῆμα θεοῦ

θεοῦ] + εἶπε Σαοῦλ τῷ παιδαρίῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ διῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν *L* 55 318 (*Jos Ant.* 6.54) (Brock, 214)

In the OG as well as the MT Saul's order to his servant is only implicit and its explication in *L* is no doubt recensional. Josephus, however, may explicate the detail for dramatic reasons – note that he uses entirely different vocabulary: καὶ ὁ μὲν Σαοῦλος ἀποπέμπεται τὸν ἀκόλουθον.⁴²

Ant. 6.120 Πολλὰς γοῦν κατακόψαντες μυριάδας τῶν Παλαιστίνων δείλης ὀψίας ἐπὶ διαρπαγὴν τοῦ στρατοπέδου τῶν Παλαιστίνων τρέπονται ...

14:32 וַיִּשְׁלַח שָׁאוּל אֶת-הַיָּדָיו עַל-הָאֵלֹהִים (MT^Q) καὶ ἐκλίθη ὁ λαὸς εἰς τὰ σκῦλα

ἐκλίθη] ὥρμησεν *L* d(370vid) 318 554; τρέπονται *Jos Ant.* 6.120

Hexaplaric: σ' ἐτράπη θ' ὥρμησε 92
εἰς] ἐπὶ *L* *Jos Ant.* 6.120 (Ulrich, 78, 178)

The agreement between Josephus and *L* in the preposition ἐπὶ is only apparent: both ὀρμάω (*L*) and τρέπω (Josephus; note that the same verb is found in σ') are regularly construed with the preposition ἐπὶ (see LSJ).⁴³ MSS d 318 554 follow *L* in changing the verb – the reading may come from Theodotion as witnessed by MS 92 – but leave the preposition untouched. Concerning 4QSam^a in this reading, see p. 173.

Ant. 6.152 Σαοῦλος δὲ κατασχεῖν βουλόμενος τὸν Σαμουήλον ἐλλαμβάνεται τῆς διπλοῖδος καὶ βιαίας τῆς ὀλκῆς διὰ τὸ μεθ' ὀρμῆς ἀπιέναι τὸν Σαμουήλον γενομένης διασχίζει τὸ ἱμάτιον.

15:27 וַיִּשְׁלַח שָׁאוּל אֶת-הַיָּדָיו עַל-הָאֵלֹהִים καὶ ἐκράτησεν Σαοῦλ τοῦ πτερυγίου τῆς διπλοῖδος αὐτοῦ

ἐκράτησεν] ἐπελάβετο (απ. 82-93*) *L*; ἐλλαμβάνεται *Jos* (Ulrich, 54, 175)

⁴² Brock provides no comment.

⁴³ Ulrich provides no comment.

Ant. 6.153 τοῦ δὲ προφήτου τὴν βασιλείαν οὕτως [αὐτοῦ] διασχισθῆναι
φῆσαντος ...

διαίρεθήσεται] σχισθήσεται *L* 554^{mg} *La*^M *Tert Marc.* 2,24,7; διασχισθῆναι
Jos Ant. 6.153 (Brock, 214)

1 Sam 15:27, 28, 29 διαρρήγνυμι twice ... διαιρέω] διαρρήγνυμι twice ... σχίζω
L 554^{mg}; διασχίζω twice *Jos Ant.* 6.152, 153

Ant. 6.167 φήσαντος δέ τινος αὐτῷ τῶν παρόντων ἐν Βηθλεέμῃ πόλει
τεθεᾶσθαι Ἰησοαίου μὲν υἱόν ...

⁴⁸ Rengstorff, *Concordance* 1:451–2.

16:18 בֵּית־הַלְּחֶמִי בֶן־יֵשׁוּעַ יָרָא אֶת־יֵסָאִי בְּתוֹלְדוֹ יֵסָאִי בְּתוֹלְדוֹ
ἑώρακα υἱὸν τῷ Ιεσσαὶ Βηθλεεμίτην

Βηθλεεμίτην] ἐν (+ τῇ 19') Βηθλέεμ *L* 92^{mg} *Jos Ant.* 6.167; ἐκ Βηθλέεμ *V CI a f* 29 55 71 158 318 707; εἰς Βηθλέεμ 245⁴⁹ (Brock, 214–15)

Josephus' formulation "when a certain bystander said that he had seen in the city of Bethlehem a son of Jesse"⁵⁰ probably reflects the reading ἐν Βηθλέεμ (*L* 92^{mg}). Brock provides no comment on this instance in his list, but in his appendix on proper names under בֵּית הַלְּחֶמִי he suggests that since in 16:1 the expression is rendered as ἕως εἰς Βηθλεεμ, ἐν/ἐκ Βηθλέεμ "may well be original" in 16:18.⁵¹ It may be that in 1 Sam 16:1 and 16:18 the translator understood the last *yôd* in the expression בֵּית הַלְּחֶמִי as a paragogic vowel like a *hê locale*. In the former verse this has led to a translation "let me send you to Iessai as far as to Bethlehem" (NETS) and in the latter it could have resulted in an interpretation "I have seen a son of Jesse who dwells in Bethlehem." Also, the use of the article in the latter part of a compound name in a gentilic adjective may well have been strange to the translator. If this is correct, the OG reading in 16:18 probably is ἐν Βηθλέεμ, retained in the *L*-text. If the change to ἐκ Βηθλέεμ (*V CI* etc.) is not merely a transcriptional error it is probably because the copyist thought that the emphasis should be on where the son of Jesse is *from*, not where the speaker had seen him. The reading of B and the majority is best explained as an early Hebraizing correction.⁵² If this analysis is correct, Josephus and *L* agree in the original reading.

Ant. 6.184 καὶ περιθεὶς αὐτῷ τὸν αὐτοῦ θώρακα καὶ περιζώσας τὸ ξίφος καὶ περικεφαλαίαν ἀρμόσας ἐξέπεμψεν

17:38 וַיִּרְשָׁהוּ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן־יֵשׁוּעַ אֶת־יֵסָאִי בְּתוֹלְדוֹ יֵסָאִי בְּתוֹלְדוֹ
Σαουλ τὸν Δαυιδ μανδύαν καὶ περικεφαλαίαν χαλκῇν περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ

αὐτοῦ *B V* 243^{txt} *a b f* 64' 29 71 244 245 460 707] + καὶ ἐνέδυσεν τὸν Δαυιδ θώρακα *rel (Jos)*⁵³ (Brock, 215)

Brock suggests that Josephus gets the mention of θώραξ (וַיִּרְשָׁהוּ) from the Hebrew. The addition in the majority of the MSS is Hexaplaric⁵⁴ – *L* gets it

⁴⁹ The various orthographic variants to Βηθλεεμίτην and Βηθλέεμ are ignored.

⁵⁰ Translation: William Whiston, trans., *The Wars of the Jews by Flavius Josephus* (London: Dent, 1928).

⁵¹ Brock, *Recensions*, 325. The expression בֵּית הַלְּחֶמִי is found only four times in the MT, the other occurrences being 1 Sam 17:58 for which there is no OG, and 2 Sam 21:19. In 1 Sam 16:1 Βηθλεεμίτης is not found as a variant, whereas in 2 Sam 21:19 the rendering is Βηθλεεμίτης with only orthographic variants.

⁵² See the discussion of this phenomenon, p. 13.

⁵³ The apparatus is simplified.

⁵⁴ Brock, *Recensions*, 215; 66–7.

from the Hexapla.

Ant. 6.214 ἀκοντίζει τὸ δόρυ καὶ τὸ μὲν προϊδόμενος ὁ Δαυίδης ἐξέκλινε
φεύγει δέ ...

19:10 נִסַּךְ יְדֵי בָקִיר תִּתְּנֶנָּה וְיִלְאֶשׁ מִפָּנָיו וַיִּטְּרֵהוּ καὶ ἀπέστη Δαυιδ ἐκ προσώπου
Σαουλ καὶ ἐπάταξεν τὸ δόρυ εἰς τὸν τοῖχον καὶ Δαυιδ ἀνεχώρησεν

ἀπέστη] ἐξέκλινε *L* 554^{mg} *Chr Dav.* 1,4 *Jos Ant.* 6.214 (Brock, 215)

Brock: “Not necessarily interdependent.”⁵⁵ According to Rengstorf, Josephus uses the verb ἀφίστημι in the sense ‘withdraw,’ ‘move off,’ ‘retreat’ as well as ‘to turn away’ – ἐκκλίνω (Josephus: ‘to turn [aside, away]’) is more readily understood in the last mentioned meaning.⁵⁶

Ant. 6.298 μέγα φρονούσιν ἐφ’ αὐτοῖς οἱ δραπεταὶ καὶ σεμνύνονται τοὺς
δεσπότης καταλιπόντες

25:10 וְיָדְעוּ מִפָּנָיו שֶׁאֵין מִצָּרָתָהּ רַבּוּ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה הַיּוֹם שִׁמְרוֹן מִפְּלִיטָה מֵעַיִן הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה οἱ δραπεταὶ ἀναχωροῦντες ἕκαστος ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ

ἀναχωροῦντες] ἀποδιδράσκοντες (διαδ. 158) *L* 731^{mg} 509 158 554^{mg}
Tht I Reg. 584; οἱ δραπεταὶ ... καταλιπόντες *Jos Ant.* 6.298 (Ulrich, 186)
Hexaplaric: θ’ ἀποδιδράσκοντες 243

Ulrich parallels this case with *Ant.* 7.98 = 2 Sam 8:1 in which he claims that Josephus’ paraphrase πολλὴν τῆς χώρας ἀποτεμώμενος καὶ προσορίσας τῇ τῶν Ἑβραίων reflects the LXX reading ἀφωρισμένην “what had been marked off” (NETS) by reproducing the prefix απο- and the participle form in ἀποτεμώμενος, and the root ὀρίζω in προσορίσας. Therefore, according to Ulrich, in *Ant.* 6.298 = 1 Sam 25:10 Josephus’ δραπετής ‘runaway’ might be seen as reflecting the root διδράσκω, and καταλιπόντες the participle of the *L*-reading ἀποδιδράσκοντες: “J reflects a Gk compound by reproducing the root of one word and the morpheme in another.”⁵⁷ However, the verb ἀναχωρέω (B and the majority) would not be a very good choice to denote running away from one’s master: it mostly means retreating, withdrawing, or retiring. Josephus himself uses the verb this way.⁵⁸ Feldman notes that Josephus wants to make a sharp contrast between David and Nabal and therefore “Josephus’ Nabal uses stronger language in remarking that nowadays fugitives (δραπεταὶ

⁵⁵ Brock, *Recensions*, 215. Mentioned also by Brock in his list of lexical variants in *L* (p. 271) but without comment.

⁵⁶ Rengstorf, *Concordance* 1:281–2; 1:602 [2:56].

⁵⁷ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 183, 186.

⁵⁸ Rengstorf, *Concordance* 1:114–16: “to go back, return, return home; to retreat, march off, go away, go; to go over (to the enemy).”

‘runaway slaves’) think much of themselves and boast of deserting their masters.”⁵⁹ For these reasons it seems plausible that Josephus had the B-reading in his LXX but altered the expression to οἱ δραπεταί ... τοὺς δεσπότας καταλιπόντες for his own reasons.

Ant. 6.323 ἐπερχόμενος δὲ λάθρα τοῖς πλησιοχώροις τῶν Παλαιστίνων Σερρίταις καὶ Ἀμαληκίταις διήρπαζεν αὐτῶν τὴν χώραν ...

27:8 קָלְמָהְיִי רִיגְהִי רִישָׁה־לָּא וּשְׁפָיִי וְשָׁאֵי תִּדְ לַעֲיִי (MT^Q) καὶ ἀνέβαινεν Δαυὶδ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπετίθεντο ἐπὶ πάντα τὸν Γεσιρι καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀμαληκίτην

Γεσιρι] ἐγγίζοντα καὶ ἐξέτεινον ἐπὶ τὸν γεσσουραῖον καὶ τὸν ἰεζραῖον *L f* 158 554^{mg}; τοῖς πλησιοχώροις *Jos Ant.* 6.323 (Brock, 215)

In the B-text David and his men perform raids from Ziklag “on every Gesiri and on the Amalekite” whereas according to the *L*-text they made raids on “all that were near and extended [the raids] on the Geshurites and the Girzites” as well. Josephus relates that David secretly attacked the “Serrites [no doubt reflecting Geshurites and/or Girzites] and the Amalekites that were neighbors to the Philistines.” How did Josephus get the information that the “Serrites” and the Amalekites lived near the Philistine region? Brock (following Mez) suggests that the reading τοῖς πλησιοχώροις in *Ant.* was coined by the *L*-reading ἐγγίζοντα.⁶⁰ However, there does not seem to be any compelling reasons to accept this. Rahlfs, commenting Mez’s list, dismissed the reading suggesting that Josephus provided the geographical note in order to make the text more easily understandable.⁶¹ This appears to be the simplest solution to Josephus’ reading.

2.3 Conclusion

The close inspection has revealed that of the twelve agreements between Josephus and *L* suggested by Brock and Ulrich, three are found to be only apparent (14:32, 15:29, 25:10) and six coincidental (8:11, 9:21, 27; 15:27, 19:10, 27:8). That Josephus and *L* should coincide now and then is by no means surprising: Josephus frequently utilizes his own chosen vocabulary, and of all the LXX

⁵⁹ Feldman, “Josephus’ Portrait of David”, 152.

⁶⁰ Brock, *Recensions*, 215. The instance was included in Mez’s list (no. 100). Brock, *Recensions*, 269 also suggests that is the original LXX reading: the translator of 1 Samuel never ends names of the peoples in -i. The translator may have read the Hebrew text as שָׁאֵי (ה). If this is correct, Josephus’ possible attestation to the readings is of course not problematic.

⁶¹ “Josephus’ τοῖς πλησιοχωροις των Παλαιστινων braucht nicht auf *L*’s παντα τον εγγιζοντα zurückzugehen, sondern kann eine von Josephus zur Erleichterung des Verständnisses hinzugefügte geographische Notiz sein.” Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 87.

witnesses, lexical variants are found most frequently in *L*. In two of the agreements (2:22, 17:38) *L* attests a Hexaplaric reading and Josephus is including the same material from the Hebrew text – probably from memory. The connection with Symmachus in 14:32 / *Ant.* 6.120 might hint at the possibility that the LXX text or texts utilized by Josephus already had Hebraizing readings of the same tradition that finally led to the later Jewish versions. In one case Josephus and *L* may agree in preserving the original reading (16:18 ἐν Βηθλέεμ) against the B-text.

3 Hippolytus

3.1 Prolegomena

The traditional view is that Hippolytus (Hipp, d. ca. 235 CE) was a Roman presbyter of Greek descent at the time of Bishop Zephyrinus (199–217 CE). In the words of Kannengiesser, “[a]s a truly creative pioneer in the field of Christian exegesis, he published at least twelve scriptural commentaries.”¹ Among these is *De David et Goliath* (*Dav.*), which has survived in Armenian extracts (*Arm.*) and a complete Georgian translation (*Georg.*) made from the Armenian, both published by Gérard Garitte.² Altogether 13 passages from 1 Samuel are quoted in this work. In addition, verse 2:35 is quoted in Hippolytus’ *De benedictionibus Isaaci et Jacobi* (page 145; Armenian version) and *Commentarium in Daniele* (4,30,9).

Despite the wide acceptance of the designation “Hippolytus of Rome,” the identity of the author of the works that are circulated under this name is one of the most puzzling questions of early church history.³ Eusebius equates him with a bishop, calling him ‘a president’ (προεστώς) of a congregation and the author of several letters and commentaries (*Hist. eccl.* 6,20,2). Jerome calls Hippolytus bishop of an unknown see and gives an 18-item list of Hippolytus’ works (*De viris illustribus* 61). Since in both these references Hippolytus is recorded after Beryllus of Bostra (or ‘Bosra’, the provincial capital of Arabia Petraea), it is noteworthy that numerous medieval Armenian MSS of Hippolytus’ works connect the author with Bostra. Theodoret, too, includes Hippolytus under “teachers of the east” (*Eranistes* 1,77; 88 [*florilegia* 22–6 are attributed to Hippolytus]) while a few ancient authors locate Hippolytus in Rome.⁴ Early modern studies located Hippolytus in the east, but in 1853 Johann Joseph Ignaz

¹ C. Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis* (The Bible in Ancient Christianity 1–2; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 528–29. For earlier discussion on the identity and literary activity of Hippolytus, see D. Dunbar, “The Problem of Hippolytus of Rome: A Study in Historical-Critical Reconstruction”, *JETS* 25:1 (1982): 63–74.

² G. Garitte, “Fragments arméniens du traité d’Hippolyte sur David et Goliath”, *Mus* 76 (1963); Garitte, *Traité d’Hippolyte sur David et Goliath, sur le Cantique des cantiques et sur l’Antéchrist: Version géorgienne* (CSCO 263: Scriptores Iberici, tomus 15; Leuven: Peeters, 1965). The collations of the Georgian version for this study are done from Garitte’s Latin translation: *Traité d’Hippolyte sur David et Goliath, sur le Cantique des cantiques et sur l’Antéchrist: Version géorgienne* (CSCO 264: Scriptores Iberici, tomus 16; Leuven: Peeters, 1965).

³ For a comprehensive analysis of the ancient documents pertaining to Hippolytus as well as a brief history of research, see J. A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus* (Oxford Theological Monographs. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

⁴ Cerrato, *Hippolytus*, 28–9, 55–6, 69–70, 74–5, 83–90.

von Döllinger put forward the theory of Hippolytus as a Roman anti-pope.⁵ After Döllinger, the Hippolytan corpus was mainly considered unified and of western origin.⁶ A major shift came with Pierre Nautin's *Hippolyte et Josipe* in 1947. Nautin suggested that the Hippolytan corpus should be divided between two authors: the polemical theological treatises to a Roman named Ἰώσηπος and the Biblical commentaries to an eastern mid-third century Hippolytus. The authors of the two blocks are very different both theologically and psychologically.⁷ Nautin's theory has raised much criticism, especially the identification of the Ἰώσηπος.⁸

However, the division of the corpus into two and the eastern provenance of the commentaries gained support from Italian scholars, notably Vincenzo Loi and Manlio Simonetti.⁹ Simonetti suggests that the provenance lies in Asia Minor.¹⁰ Cerrato, too, opts for an eastern authorship and after manifold historical and literary considerations he suggests that the author of the commentaries most probably lived in one of the following areas: Asia Minor, Egypt beyond Alexandria, Palestine (apart from Jerusalem), mainland Greece and Peloponnese, and the Greek islands.¹¹

Little has been written on Hippolytus' Bible text. The most important study deals with the Daniel commentary: *Der Bibeltext im Daniel-Kommentar des Hippolyt von Rom* by J. Ziegler. The text-historical situation in 1 Samuel is, of course, very different from that in Daniel. However, two observations made by Ziegler are of interest from our point of view. Firstly, Ziegler observed that Hippolytus' quotations mostly go together with B.¹² Secondly, some of Hippolytus' singular readings may witness a genuine text form no longer attested by Biblical MSS.¹³

⁵ J.J.I. von Döllinger, *Hippolytus und Kallistus, oder die römische Kirche in der ersten Hälfte des dritten Jahrhunderts* (Regensburg: Joseph Manz, 1853).

⁶ Cerrato, Hippolytus, 76–7; 95–8.

⁷ P. Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe: contribution a l'histoire de la littérature chrétienne du troisième siècle* (Études et textes pour l'histoire du dogme de la Trinité 1; Paris: Cerf, 1947), 98–100, 103.

⁸ See Cerrato, Hippolytus, 80–1. Especially severe criticism: Dunbar, "The Problem", 70–3.

⁹ Several important studies are published as proceedings of two conferences on Hippolytus in *Ricerche su Ippolito* (SEAug 13; Rome: Institutum patristicum "Augustinianum", 1977) and *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito* (SEAug 30; Rome: Institutum patristicum "Augustinianum", 1989). See especially: V. Loi, "L'identità letteraria di Ippolito di Roma", 86–8 (*Ricerche*, 67–88); M. Simonetti, "A modo di conclusione: una ipotesi di lavoro", 155 (*Ricerche*, 151–6). The traditional view is defended by J. Frickel, "Ippolito di Roma, scrittore e martire" (*Nuove ricerche*, 23–41). In Frickel's view the two blocks of literature attributed to Hippolytus (represented in his study by *Refutatio omnium haeresium* [*Haer.*], often called *Elenchos* by patristic scholars, and *Contra haeresin Noeti* [*Noet.*]) have different focuses and theological orientations and this must be taken into account. "Perhaps then the major part of their seeming contradictions can be explained and understood ... The difference between [*Haer.* and *Noet.*] is not in their theology but in their style of presentation which is conditioned by the very different audiences." (p. 38–9; trans. mine.)

¹⁰ Simonetti, "Aggiornamento su Ippolito", 124 (*Nuove ricerche*, 75–130).

¹¹ Cerrato, Hippolytus, 250–2.

¹² J. Ziegler, *Der Bibeltext im Daniel-Kommentar des Hippolyt von Rom* (Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen i. philologisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1952, Nr. 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952), 173.

¹³ Ziegler, *Bibeltext*, 190, 196–7.

It is impossible to date *De David et Goliath* with any precision. The Georgian version exists in two MSS, T (copied ca. 973–6) and J (12th–13th century). In both the work is attributed to “Hippolytus” (J: “Holy Father Hippolytus”). The texts of the MSS are close to each other, deviating only rarely in important readings.¹⁴ Garitte, however, is of the opinion that the text of T and J may not give a very accurate picture of the original Georgian translation. Moreover, the version is not made directly from Greek but from Armenian. The complete Armenian work is lost, but a series of fragments are preserved in a 12th century catena MS containing the Armenian Books of Kings and marginal comments by John Chrysostom, Ephraem, and Hippolytus. The signum for Hippolytus is attached to only two passages, but actually most of the commentary corresponds to the Georgian version.¹⁵ The Armenian text is found in two MSS (E and F), which often give a very different text. From comparison between the Armenian and Georgian versions Garitte concludes that the differences are due to innovations and renovations made in MS F. There are substantial differences of length between *Georg.* and *Arm.*¹⁶

Garitte complains that the Georgian translator was far from a talented one; the translation is “often obscure, incoherent, even incomprehensible.” The copyists of the extant MSS do not strive to improve the intelligibility of the text but, on the contrary, corrupt the text even more. Given the conditions, Garitte has opted for a very slavish Latin translation, not trying to clear up the obscurities. One Latin term is used consistently to render one Georgian term. The Georgian word order, too, is retained whenever possible. If one Georgian word must be rendered with several Latin words, the Latin words are hyphenated: e.g. *per-spiritum* corresponds to the instrumental case *sulit’a*, *per spiritum* to the periphrastic construction with genitive + postposition *sulisa mier*.¹⁷

So far only Brock has used *De David and Goliath* as a proto-Lucianic witness. Garitte’s edition of *Georg.*, however, was still unavailable to him and, accordingly, he used only *Arm.* comparing it with G. N. Bonwetsch’s German translation¹⁸ (made via a Russian one) of the Georgian. Brock’s evaluation of *Arm.* is that its compiler has a tendency to abbreviate – this applies to the biblical quotations as well. Brock assumes that contamination from the Armenian Bible version has taken place in a few instances.¹⁹ With Garitte’s edition, a

¹⁴ Garitte, CSCO 263, I–III; VI. See n. 2 for the complete reference.

¹⁵ Garitte, CSCO 263, VII–VIII. A table of the corresponding passages between *Georg.* and *Arm.*: Garitte, “Fragments”, 282–3.

¹⁶ Garitte, “Fragments”, 283 (trans. mine):

The Armenian [version] is often shorter than the Georgian; in several instances, the redactor of the catena [i.e. *Arm.*] abridges or summarizes the text of Hippolytus; in certain passages, however, it may be asked if it has not conserved a text more complete than that of the Georgian version: thus, in § 30 [= *Georg.* 4,3], where the Armenian presents a biblical quotation not present in the Georgian; in § 78, § 80, and § 109 [roughly *Georg.* 12,2 and 16,5], where the phrase continues in the Armenian beyond that provided by the Georgian, without an appearance – in the Armenian – of juxtaposition of two extracts of different origin.

¹⁷ Garitte, CSCO 263, IX; CSCO 264, II–IV.

¹⁸ G.N. Bonwetsch, *Drei georgisch erhaltene Schriften von Hippolytus* (TU 26:1; 1904).

¹⁹ Brock, *Recensions*, 197–9.

more comprehensive survey of the quotations from 1 Samuel in *Dav.* can be carried out. Brock found only “one or two distinctive *L* readings” in *Arm.*²⁰ – taking *Georg.* into account will give a little higher figure.

Not all of the quotations from 1 Samuel in *De David and Goliath* are included here; most of the quotations are interesting only from the point of view of Hippolytus’ quoting technique and the habits of the Georgian and Armenian translators. In the analysis only the most striking agreements or disagreements with *L* are noted, and only a few lines of context from Hippolytus’ text is given. The complete text of the quotations is given in Appendix A together with the Greek texts of Rahlfs and Ant.

In the following, *Georg.* and *Arm.* (listed and treated in this order since *Georg.* is taken as the complete text) followed by chapter and paragraph numbers refer to Garitte’s Latin translation of the Georgian version and the Armenian fragments in CSCO 264. In a few instances *Arm.* is followed by ‘§’ and a numeral: these passages are not included in the CSCO editions, but are present in the edition in *Le Muséon*. The Latin text in the edition is in roman type; I have, however, given the quotations in italics. The quotations are analyzed in the order of their appearance in *De David and Goliath*.

In the text critical apparatuses, readings of the Georgian Bible version (Ge) are given in order to demonstrate that the biblical quotations in *Georg.* seem not to have been affected by it. On this I have relied on the collations of the Georgian Bible made by Anna Kharanauli. Several valuable comments concerning Georgian have been received from Andres Piquer Otero and from Pablo Torijano Morales concerning the Armenian language and Bible version.

3.2 Analysis

Georg. 6 *Et Saul et totus populus Israelis congregati sunt in-valle et praeparati sunt ad-bellandum adversus alienigenas*

Arm. § 39 *et Israel congregatus est in valles et aciem-instruxit*

17:2 וַיִּשְׁאַל וַאֲשֶׁר־יִשְׂרָאֵל נֶאֱסָפוּ וַיַּחֲנוּ בְּעֶמֶק הָאֵלֶּה καὶ Σαουλ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλ συνάγονται καὶ παρεμβάλλουσιν ἐν τῇ κοιλάδι

συνάγονται] συνήχθησαν *L* Ge (aorist) ≈ *congregati sunt* Hipp *Georg.* 6; (*Israel*) *congregatus est* Hipp *Arm.* § 39 (past tense)

Both *Georg.* and *Arm.* seem to attest the past tense of *L* against the historic present. However, these versions attest a past tense throughout – this is no doubt due to the dislike for the historic present in the Georgian and Armenian languages. Accordingly, the agreement is very likely only apparent.

²⁰ Brock, *Recensions*, 201.

Hipp Georg. 6 Et constitit homo unus e gente alienigenarum, nomen dictum est ei Goliath Gethensis

Cf. *Georg. 7,4 Egressus est homo unus potens e castris alienigenarum, et nomen eius Goliath*

Cf. *Arm. 7,4 egrediebatur homo potens ex acie alienigenarum, Goliath nomine (Arm.^F; nomen eius Arm.^E)*

17:4 וַיֵּצֵא אִישׁ אֶחָד מִן־הַגִּבּוֹרִים וְשֵׁם אֵשֶׁת אֵלִיָּהוּ וַיֵּצֵא אֶת־הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה מִן־הַגִּבּוֹרִים וַיֵּצֵא אֶת־הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה מִן־הַגִּבּוֹרִים וַיֵּצֵא אֶת־הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה מִן־הַגִּבּוֹרִים καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἀνὴρ δυνατός ἐκ τῆς παρατάξεως τῶν ἀλλοφύλων

ἐκ (1^o) *Hipp Georg. 7,4 Arm. 7,4]* + παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ *L 245^S*; + *gente Hipp Georg. 6*

τῆς (> *a*) παρατάξεως (παρεμβολῆς 318) *Hipp Georg. 7,4 Arm. 7,4 (acie)]*
> *Ge^J Hipp Georg. 6; gente Ge^{DOS}*

These two readings are best dealt with together. Brock includes the former reading in his list “Hipp-Arm = LXX against L.”²¹ Hippolytus’ quotation in 7,4, however, clearly does not attest the plus of παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ in *L*. On the other hand, the quotation in *Georg. 6* might attest τοῦ λαοῦ with *L 245^S* (but not παντός). However, it lacks a correspondence to τῆς παρατάξεως, which is attested in chapter 7 by both *Georg.* (*castra* ‘encampment’) and *Arm.* (*acies* ‘line of battle, battle-array’). This comparison along with the quite free formulation *et constitit homo unus* for καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἀνὴρ δυνατός suggests that these readings in *Georg. 6* are nothing more than abridgment by Hippolytus or the translator and best disregarded.

Georg. 6 cassis aeris super caput eius; et in-lorica-squamata eius humerale sicut concatenatae (lit. catenae = loricae-squamatae) paenulae (lit. [vestimenti] impositi) qua indutus erat, et pondus (lit. statera) loricae-squamatae eius tria milia siclorum (sikla) aeris; et ocreae aeris in-femoribus eius et clipeus aeris in-humeris eius

Cf. *Georg. 7,10 Erat Goliathis cassis aeris in-capite eius et ocreae aeris in-femoribus eius ... Et quod dicit «clipeus aeris in-humeris eius» ...*

²¹ Brock, *Recensions*, 200.

17:5 וְשָׂרֵי עֲרֵב נִשְׁחָטוּ וְכֹבֵד וְכֹבֵד וְכֹבֵד καὶ περικεφαλαία ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ

περικεφαλαία] + χαλκῇ *L CI 55 158 318 554* (+ χαλκῇ post αὐτοῦ 1° 245^S)
Ge^L; + *aeris* (*rvalisay* ‘bronze’ T; *spilenjisay* ‘copper’ J)²² Hipp *Georg.* 6
7,10; + *aerea* Hipp *Arm.* 7,10 (Vg.)

The plus is present in the Lucianic witnesses, the catena-group *CI*, and in Hippolytus’ text both in Armenian and Georgian (and possibly in Josephus, *Ant.* 6,171²³). Brock suggests that the reading is a very early Hebraizing addition reflecting נִשְׁחָטוּ ‘copper, bronze’ of the MT.²⁴ In MS 243 of the *CI*-group, however, the reading is sub λ’, denoting that it comes from “the rest of the translations = the Three.”²⁵ This suggests that the Greek MSS very likely derive it from the Hexapla. Its attestation by Hippolytus can be explained in two ways: 1. Hexaplaric readings have intruded into textual transmission of *De David et Goliath*. In the course of the analysis, however, no further evidence for this phenomenon has been found. 2. Hippolytus’ attestation to the reading is coincidental: in the near context the coat of chain mail, the greaves, and the shield are mentioned to be of bronze. If the material of the helmet is not mentioned, the reader is inclined to think that it was some material other than bronze – most likely leather. In order to avoid such an image, Hippolytus, the Armenian and Georgian translators, or the copyists may well have added “of bronze” without connection to any Greek MS tradition.

Georg. 6 *et stetit et vociferatus est* (lit. *vocem fecit*) *adversus castra Israelitarum et dixit: «Quare venitis ad-bellandum in-nos? [»]*

Arm. § 49 *vociferatus est in aciem Israelis et ait ad eos: «Cur egredimini aciem-struere in bellum adversus nos? [»]*

17:8 וְשָׂרֵי עֲרֵב נִשְׁחָטוּ וְכֹבֵד וְכֹבֵד וְכֹבֵד τί ἐκπορεύεσθε παρατάξασθαι πολέμῳ

τί] ἵνα τί *L CII s 55 554; quare* Hipp *Georg.* 6; *cur* Hipp *Arm.* § 49

²² ‘Bronze’ and ‘copper’ are Garitte’s renderings of the words. In Sardshweladse and Fährnich’s *Altgeorgisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* (Hamburg: Buske, 1999) both have the meaning ‘Kupfer.’

²³ Josephus’ text reads (emphasis mine): καταβάς οὖν τις τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Παλαιστίνων στρατοπέδου Γολιάθης ὄνομα· πόλεως δὲ Γίττης ἀνὴρ παμμεγεθέστατος ἦν γὰρ πηχῶν τεσσάρων καὶ σπιθαμῆς ὅπλα τῇ φύσει τοῦ σώματος ἀναλογοῦντα περικείμενος θώρακα μὲν γὰρ ἐνεδέδυτο σταθμὸν ἄγοντα πέντε χιλιάδας σίκλων, **κόρυθα** [‘helmet’] δὲ καὶ κνημίδας **χαλκέας** ὁποίας εἰκὸς ἦν ἀνδρὸς οὕτω παραδόξου τὸ μέγεθος σκεπᾶσαι μέρη, δόρυ δὲ ἦν οὐ κοῦφον βάσταγμα δεξιᾶς, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων αὐτὸ αἶρων ἔφερον, εἶχε δὲ καὶ λόγχην ἐξακοσίων σίκλων[.] Brock, *Recensions*, 200 points out that Josephus could have derived “of bronze” from the Hebrew.

²⁴ Brock, *Recensions*, 200, 201.

²⁵ On the interpretation of the sign see, e.g., Metzger, “Lucianic Recension”, 8–9.

Brock lists this reading under “Hipp-Arm = L(+) against LXX.”²⁶ The conjunction ἵνα could have been inserted to reflect the ה in the Hebrew expression הֵנָּה. Excluding this verse, the simple τί renders הֵנָּה only five times in the LXX (Gen 43:6; 2 Chr 25:15; Isa 1:11, 63:17; Dan 10:20) and never in 1 Samuel (although Tov and Polak²⁷ suggest הֵנָּה in the *Vorlage* in 5:10). In 1 Samuel the equivalents for הֵנָּה are (καὶ) ἵνα τί (11 out of 16²⁸ occurrences), κατὰ τί 4:3, μή 6:3, εἰ δὲ μή 19:17, and τί ἐστίν (σοι) 1:8.²⁹ Despite the translator’s usage, however, it is hard to see a reason to drop ἵνα out. The expression ἵνα τί was hardly considered improper – Plato, for instance, uses it (*Apol.* 26d, *Hipparch.* 225c, *Resp.* 346a, *Symposium* 205a). Moreover, in other occurrences of the phrase, the MSS never drop ἵνα out. The simple τί corresponds elsewhere in 1 Samuel exclusively to הֵנָּה.

The external evidence favors τί, and no reason for a secondary omission of ἵνα can be found; accordingly, it is best to accept τί as the original reading. The translator, however, never renders הֵנָּה by the simple τί elsewhere and that makes it probable that the *Vorlage* had just הֵנָּה (4QSam^a has a lacuna here; DJD XVII reconstructs according to the MT³⁰). Although הֵנָּה alone is not used in the sense of ‘why’ in the Books of Kingdoms, this usage is attested elsewhere (Exod 17:2; Jos 7:25; Job 15:12; Ps 42:6, 12; 43:5, 52:3; Jer 30:15, 49:4; Lam 3:39).

Contrary to Brock, Hippolytus attestation to ἵνα is very uncertain: there can hardly be any certainty about which Greek reading lies under either the Georgian *raysa* ‘what, for/in what’ or the Armenian *andēr* ‘why’.

17:8 πολέμῳ] pr ἐν 245; πόλεμον V CII a s 158 707; εἰς πόλεμον L d 554 Ge^{DOSJL}; (venitis) ad-bellandum Hipp Georg. 6; (egredimini aciem-struere) in bellum Hipp Arm. § 49

The instance is considered by Brock an agreement between Hippolytus and L.³¹ Of all the sixteen comparable cases in the LXX I located, πόλεμος as an object of παρατάσσω is denoted by εἰς + acc. ten times and with an accusative without a preposition six times (of which once with an article). The reading in the dative in the majority of the MSS in 1 Sam 17:8 is the sole representative of its type. Therefore it could be argued that it cannot come from the translator (although the occurrences of this expression are not very frequent). The proto-Lucianic reading is best in accordance with the usage of the LXX translators,

²⁶ Brock, *Recensions*, 200.

²⁷ Tov-Polak, ad loc.

²⁸ To be sure, there is an additional הֵנָּה in 1 Sam 17:28, but there is no LXX text for that verse.

²⁹ An interesting phenomenon is that ἵνα τί translates הֵנָּה first in 2:23, but then beginning only at 19:17, where the other renderings stop. After that, ἵνα τί is the standard rendering in all the Books of Kingdoms (17 out of 20 indisputable equivalents), the only exceptions being ἵνα μή in 2 Sam 2:22 and τί ὅτι in 2 Sam 7:7 and 19:26.

³⁰ Cross et al., DJD XVII, 78.

³¹ Brock, *Recensions*, 200.

but it is difficult to see a reason for a secondary omission of the preposition. However, concerning Hippolytus' reading, the question must be raised whether the Georgian and Armenian could express "come to fight" or "form the troops in battle" without a prepositional phrase. Because of this uncertainty, the agreement is best considered spurious.

Georg. 10,2 «Non exhibis³² in alienigenam; tu puer es, et ille homo pugnator a pueritia sua.»

Cf. Georg. 10,4 «*Homo pugnator est a pueritia sua*»

Cf. *Arm.* 10,4: «*Puer es tu, et ille homo bellator*»

17:33 אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה וְהוּא אֶתָּה בִּינְעָר ὅτι παιδάριον εἶ σύ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνὴρ
πολεμιστής

παιδάριον εἶ / σύ Hipp *Arm.* 10,4] tr *L* 158 Ge^{DOSJL} Chr *Hom.* 2 *Cor.* 11:1 7
Hipp *Georg.* 10,2
καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνὴρ Hipp *Georg.* 10,2] αὐτὸς δὲ ἀνὴρ ἐστὶ (> 82 Chr) *L* Chr
Hom. 2 *Cor.* 11:1 7

Agreement between Hippolytus and *L* in the word order “you are a boy”³³ may well be coincidental: Georgian prefers the word order with the subject before the verb – contrast the Armenian reading which retains the word order of B. Hippolytus clearly attests the B-text against the in all likelihood recensional αὐτὸς δὲ ἀνὴρ ἐστὶ of the *L* text.

Georg. Arm. 11,1 Pascebat servus tuus oves patris sui

17:34 τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ / ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ] tr *L*⁻¹⁹ 158 554 Chr *Hom.* 2 *Cor.* 11:1
7; ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ 19; *oves patris sui Hipp Georg. Arm.* 11,1

Brock classifies this reading as “miscellaneous” and suggests that Hipp *Arm.* is not dependent on the *L*-reading.³⁴ The same seems to hold true for Hipp *Georg.* as well. In Georgian it is thus probably due to the preferred usage of the language. The same probably holds true for the Georgian genitive construction “of his father.”³⁵

³² Garitte gives here the following footnote: “Cum negatione *ver*, sensus est quasi non poteris exire.” (With the Georgian negation *ver* the sense is: “you cannot go.”)

³³ Hipp *Georg.* does indeed reproduce *σὺ* by *shen* 'you' although the 2d person singular is included in the verb 'you are.'

³⁴ Brock, *Recensions*, 201.

³⁵ The difference in Georgian between τοῦ πατρός αὐτοῦ and τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ would be only in one vowel: *mamisa* “of his father” or *mamasa* “for his father.” The letters *a* and *i* are easily confused in *Mkhedruli* script.

17:34 וְאֶת־הַדּוֹב וְאֶת־הָאֵרִי וְכֵן לֵאמֹר וְכֵן לֵאמֹר καὶ ὅταν ἦρχετο ὁ λέων καὶ ἡ ἄρκος

καί (3°)] ἦ (ἡ 19) *L* 509 125 158 460 554 *Hipp Georg. Arm.* 11,1

Brock lists the reading as an agreement between *Hipp Arm.* and *L*.³⁶ The MT reading וְאֶת־הַדּוֹב is peculiar.³⁷ McCarter suggests that the original Hebrew read וְהַדּוֹב וְהָאֵרִי and that וְאֶת belongs to verse 36 – it was probably lost at some point and restored in front of the wrong “bear.” This is most likely the text underlying the LXX (and Peshitta).³⁸ Smith, on the other hand, adopts the emendation וְכֵן suggested by Heinrich Graetz and renders the expression as “even the bear.”³⁹ Whatever the case, the B text is probably original since all the phenomena in *L* and its companions seem to be recensional: The articles are omitted to emphasize the indefiniteness (“whenever a lion came”)⁴⁰ and the conjunction is altered to ἦ because it is obvious that only one predator came at a time (the verbs are in the singular). MS 509 seems to be halfway in this process, having ἦ while retaining the articles. Regarding Hippolytus’ reading, contrary to what Brock implies, it is likely that the Armenian (*kam* ‘or’) and Georgian (*ginat’u* ‘or, or when’) disjunctions are simply *ad sensum* without connection with the Lucianic Greek.

Georg. 11,1 *et erat, quando veniebat leo vel ursus et abripiebat e grege, protinus-veniebam et eruebam (litt. proferebam) ex ore eius et leonem et ursum occidebam ego servus tuus; et si in-me super-accedeabat, vertebam et attingebam guttur eius et confestim suffocabam.*

Arm. 11,1 *et quando veniebat leo vel ursus et capiebat ovem, egrediebar post eum et percutiebam eum et eripiebam ex ore eius; et si surgebat super me, apprehendebam (eum) collo eius et occidebam eum*

³⁶ Brock, *Recensions*, 200.

³⁷ Cf. BDB, which lists the present case under examples of an emphatic use of אֶת: “Chiefly in an inferior or later style, אֶת (or אֶת־) is used irregularly, partly (a), as it would seem, to give greater definiteness (so esp. אֶת־) at the mention of a new subject.”

³⁸ P. Kyle McCarter, *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (1st ed.: Garden City: Doubleday, 1980), 287. In 1 Samuel, אֶת־ is rendered by καί in all but two instances: 10:16 וְאֶת־דָּבִיר הַמְּלוּכָה τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τῆς βασιλείας and 12:3 וְאֶת־מִי עֲשָׂקִי ἢ τίνα κατεδυνάστευσα. The latter exception demonstrates that the translator could use ἦ for אֶת־ – in this case καί would actually have served as well.

³⁹ H.P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Books of Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979), 161; H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden I* (Leipzig, 1874), 197.

⁴⁰ To be sure, the articles could also have been omitted for transcriptional reasons: first a haplography from ἦ ἡ ἄρκος to ἡ ἄρκος and then the omission of ὁ to conform to the lack of article for ἄρκος.

17:35 ἐπάταξα 1^o] ἐπάτασσον *L*⁽⁻¹⁹⁾ 158 554 Hipp *Arm.* 11,1; > Hipp *Georg.* 11,1
 ἐξέσπασα] ἐξέσπων *O L*⁽⁻¹⁹⁾ 158 554 Hipp *Georg. Arm.* 11,1 (*eruebam* [lit. *proferebam*] *Georg.*; *eripiebam* *Arm.*)
 ἐκράτησα] ἐκράτουν *L* 158 318 Chr Hipp *Georg. Arm.* 11,1 (*attingebam* *Georg.*; *apprehendebam* *Arm.*)
 ἐπάταξα 2^o] ἐπάτασσον *L* 158 318; *suffocabam* Hipp *Georg.* 11,1; > Hipp *Arm.* 11,1
 ἐθανάτωσα] ἐθανάτουν *L* 68' 158 318 Hipp *Arm.* 11,1; > Hipp *Georg.*

A comparison between the MT, Rahlfs, and the Lucianic text in 1 Sam 17:35 reveals an interesting pattern corresponding to the Hebrew consecutive forms.

MT	Rahlfs	Ant
וַיִּצְרֹחַ	καὶ ἐξεπορευόμεν	καὶ ἐξηρχόμεν
וַיִּרְאֵ	ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ	κατόπισθεν αὐτοῦ
וַיַּכְהוּ	καὶ ἐπάταξα αὐτὸν	καὶ ἐπάτασσον αὐτὸν
וַיִּלְצֹהוּ	καὶ ἐξέσπασα	καὶ ἐξέσπων
מִפִּי	ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ,	ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.
וַיִּקַּם עָלָיו	καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο ἐπ' ἐμέ,	καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο ἐπ' ἐμέ,
וַיִּקְרָחַהוּ	καὶ ἐκράτησα	ἐκράτουν
בְּזַקְוֹ	τοῦ φάρυγγος αὐτοῦ	τοῦ φάρυγγος αὐτοῦ
וַיַּכְהוּ	καὶ ἐπάταξα	καὶ ἐπάτασσον αὐτὸν
וַיַּתִּימֵהוּ	καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αὐτόν	καὶ ἐθανάτουν αὐτόν.

The Hebrew text of David's description of what usually happened when a predator appeared while he was keeping the sheep (17:34–36) uses the perfect consecutive throughout, with the exception of the imperfect consecutive וַיִּקַּם (“and if [the predator] turned against [me]”) in v. 35. All the Greek witnesses have the imperfect for the expressions “used to keep sheep,” “whenever a lion or a bear came,” “took a lamb,” “I went after it,” and “if it turned against me” (ποιμαίνων ἦν, ἦρχετο, and ἐλάμβανεν in v. 34, ἐξεπορευόμεν and ἐπανίστατο in v. 35). However, there is variation between the aorist and imperfect tenses regarding the five actions of striking down (πατάσσω; twice), pulling from the mouth (ἐκσπάω), catching (κρατέω) by the jaw, and putting to death (θανάτω).⁴¹ The Armenian version of Hippolytus attests the imperfect tense throughout, but the Georgian text is a little shorter and has a transposition (*et leonem et ursum occidebam ego servus tuus* in the middle of the fighting scene). In the three cases where the Georgian equivalent is found, however, the tense (habitual) corresponds to the Greek imperfect.

⁴¹ It is interesting that the witnesses contain several combinations of the tenses. The MSS 158 318 554 – and to some extent 68' – are dependent on *L* and accordingly their imperfects derive from it. The group *O*, however, is probably unaffected by *L* and thus its imperfects may be only sporadic changes.

According to Brock, the imperfect is the normal way to render the perfect consecutive when referring to repeated past action. This leads him to conclude that the imperfects in v. 35 are original.⁴² There are two other passages in the Books of Samuel that are of interest for the sake of comparison: 1 Sam 2:13–17 (the normal procedures pertaining to the priests’ portion of sacrificial meat and Eli’s sons’ abuse of them) and 2 Sam 15:1–6 (Absalom steals the hearts of the people). In these passages the Hebrew perfect consecutives and imperfects are most probably rendered with Greek imperfects that have later been altered to aorist. Aejmelaeus points out that, in the Absalom story, it is the *καίγε* revision that ignores the special temporal aspect carried by the imperfects and changes them to aorists. However, in 1 Sam 2:14 the repeated past action does contain a verb of sudden movement (הִתְהַיָּבָה) which probably was rendered by the aorist (καθῆκεν, but ἐπάταξεν Rahlfs) and only later changed to the imperfect (καθίει *L*).⁴³

Could there be a similar multiplicity of temporal layers in 1 Sam 17:35? One might argue that the actions of striking down (πατάσσω), pulling from the mouth (ἐκσπάω), catching (κρατέω) by the jaw, and putting to death (θανατόω) are not happening constantly but punctually. In that case it is very convenient to use the aorist to express them. The following comparison illustrates this:

<i>Repeated past action</i>	<i>Singular instances within repeated past action</i>
Your slave was tending the flock for his father, and when the lion and the bear would come and take a sheep from the herd, and I would go after it,	then I struck it and pulled from its mouth,
and if it turned against me,	then I caught it by its throat and struck it down and put it to death .
And your slave would smite both the bear and the lion...	

If this analysis is correct, there are two possibilities: 1. The aorists are original and the imperfects come from the recensor, who wishes to harmonize the use of the tenses. 2. The translator ignored the subtle change in the temporal aspect and rendered the passage by the imperfect throughout. The aorists must then exhibit the *καίγε*-type tendency of preferring the aorist for the Hebrew imperfect consecutive, and Hippolytus and *L* attest the original form of the text.

⁴² Brock, *Recensions*, 200, n. 16.

⁴³ Aejmelaeus, “The Septuagint of 1 Samuel”, 137–8.

To me the latter option seems more likely and for that reason I very tentatively suggest accepting the imperfects as original.

Georg. 11,1 et leonem et ursum occidebam ego servus tuus

Arm. 11,1 leonem et ursum evertibat servus tuus

17:36 וְכִּי־הָיָה הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל גַּם־אֶת־הָאֲרִי גַם־כַּאֲרִי וְהָאֲרִי גַם־כַּאֲרִי וְהָאֲרִי גַם־כַּאֲרִי
λέοντα

καὶ τὸν λέοντα B CII a b s] ante καί 1° tr rel Hipp *Georg. Arm. 11,1* = MT

In verse 34 the predators are mentioned in the order “lion–bear” – the same order may be expected here. Thus the best explanation for the word order in the B text is that καὶ τὸν λέοντα has dropped out by an oversight, and it has been inserted as a marginal gloss in the wrong place in the text. Hippolytus and *L* attest the original text.⁴⁴

Georg. 11,1 Et Dominus, qui salvavit me ex ore leonis et e brachiis ursi, ille idem salvabit me e manibus huius alienigenae incircumcisi.

17:37 וְכִּי־הָיָה הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל גַּם־אֶת־הָאֲרִי גַם־כַּאֲרִי וְהָאֲרִי גַם־כַּאֲרִי וְהָאֲרִי גַם־כַּאֲרִי
λέοντος καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς τῆς ἄρκου

χειρός 1°] στόματος (pr τοῦ 554) L 55 158 554 Sa Tht I Reg. 565
Hipp *Georg. 11,1*

Hexaplaric: θ' στόματος 243-731(s nom)

The instance is not discussed by Brock since the quotation is extant only in *Georg.* “Delivered from the mouth of the lion” is an expression quite often used in the Greek Bible.⁴⁵ “The mouth of the lion” without reference to deliverance appears several times elsewhere (Judg 14:8, 9 [B]; Dan 6:23 [θ']; Heb 11:33; Rev 13:2), but expression “the hand of the lion” is found only in Dan 6:17 and 28 [θ']. The Theodotion reading preserved in 243-731 points to an early variant, which would explain the attestation of the reading by both Hippolytus and *L*.

Georg. 13,1 Canis nonne sum ego, quia ad-me (lit. mihi) supervenis cum-baculo et lapidibus?

Arm. § 84 Num canis sum, quod cum-baculo et lapide venis super me?

⁴⁴ Brock, *Recensions*, 141, arrives at the same conclusion.

⁴⁵ 1 Macc 2:60; Ps 21:22[22:21]; Amos 3:12 (“As the shepherd rescues from the mouth of the lion...”); Dan 6:19, 21 (θ'); 2 Tim 4:17.

17:43 օճեի իմ անի օճեի կւոն Էցո Էիմի

օճեի] μή *L* 318 554^c Ge^{DSL}; *nonne* (et tr post *canis*) Hipp Georg. 13,1; *num* Hipp Arm. 13,1; > Ge^J

Brock gives the instance as an agreement between Hipp Arm. and *L*.⁴⁶ In Greek, the rhetoric question expects a negative answer – thus the sense of օճեի կւոն Էցո Էիմի is “surely I am not a dog.” The reading μή probably comes from the Lucianic recensor. The corresponding Armenian reading (*mi t’e*) is an adverbial construction that makes the clause a question; there is no direct equivalent to it in English. The Georgian negative is simple ‘not’ (*nu*).⁴⁷ The agreement with the *L* reading, however, is likely only coincidental: either Hippolytus or the translators may have felt the need to explicate the meaning of Goliath’s words.

Arm. 13,1 *ait David: «Ille etiam vilior quam canis».*

17:43 καὶ εἶπεν Δαυὶδ οὐχὶ ἄλλ’ ἢ χεῖρω κυνός Hipp Arm. 13,1 (cum v. 1.)] > A
O L Ge^{FOJ} Hipp Georg. 13,1 = MT

The sentence undoubtedly belongs to the original LXX and A O L attest a Hexaplaric omission. The sentence is clearly attested by Arm. (*Ille etiam vilior quam canis*). It would be intriguing to see this as Hexaplaric influence in Georg., but in the case of a quotation, to suppose such a long minus would be *argumentum e silentio*.⁴⁸

Georg. 13,2 *Tu in-me (litt. mihi) supervenis cum-gladio et hasta, et ego ad-te (litt. tibi) venio in nomine (litt. per-nomen) Domini omnipotentis*

Arm. 13,2 *Tu venis super me cum-gladio et hasta, et ego venio super te per-nomen Domini potentiarum*

17:45 πορεύομαι (-σομαι 121 527 d^{-106.610} 64’ 244 460)] ἔρχομαι *L* Asterius, *Fragmenta in Psalmos* 22 Chr Dav. 3,6 Tht 1 Reg. 568 Hipp Georg. Arm. 13,2 (*venio*); πρόσαγω V C’ f s^{-64’} 29 55

⁴⁶ Brock, *Recensions*, 200.

⁴⁷ Garitte’s rendering is not the most literal one: Latin *nonne* expects an affirmative answer which is hardly Goliath’s meaning, although later Hippolytus does claim that Goliath said himself that he is “a dog and impure” (13,2).

⁴⁸ However, since Hippolytus is commenting nearly everything that takes place in chapter 17, Brock, *Recensions*, 198, is probably right in assuming that if Hippolytus had known the passages 17:12–31 and 17:55–18:6 he would have referred to their content. On the methodological issues in dealing with patristic minuses, see Osburn, “Methodology”, 325–6.

The LXX translator has probably opted for the verb πορεύομαι because the point of view changes: “you are coming—you are coming—I am *going*”. Thus the verb ἔρχομαι seems recensional: it results from conformation to the previously used verbal root (17:43 ἐξῆλθες, 17:45a ἔρχη). In Georgian the same verbal root is used in translating several Greek verbs of movement by adding preverbal elements (in this case *zedamomival* “you are coming upon me” twice and *mogival* “I am coming/going to you”). The understanding of the movement as ‘coming’ or ‘going’ depends on the point of view. In Armenian the same verbal root (*gas* [twice], *gam*) is used in all three instances regardless of the point of view. This may be the choice of the Armenian translator and does not have to depend on the Greek wording of Hippolytus. Thus, while the usage in Georgian and Armenian formally corresponds to that used in *L*, the agreement is hardly striking.

Georg. 13,2 et te concludet Deus in-manibus meis

Arm. 13,2 et concludet te Dominus in manum meam

17:46 τὴν χεῖρα (ἐν + dat. A) Hipp *Arm. 13,2*] τὰς χεῖράς *L* 121 245 Tht
Hipp *Georg. 13,2*

While in Hipp *Georg.* the expression “in my hands” is in the plural, the same expression in *Arm.* is in the singular. Moreover, the expression “into someone’s hands” is always found in the plural in *Georg.* and the Georgian translation of Hippolytus’ *De antichristo*:

Georg. 5,3 Saul ... [i]n-animo-habebat ut manibus alienigenarum iniceret (illum)

1 Sam 18:25 καὶ Σαουλ ἐλογίσατο αὐτὸν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς χεῖρας τῶν ἀλλοφύλων

Antichr. 34 et te iam non dabo manibus hominum

Cf. Isa 47:3 οὐκέτι μὴ παραδῶ ἀνθρώποις

Antichr. 35 ego tibi dedi eos manibus tuis

Isa 47:6 ἐγὼ ἔδωκα εἰς τὴν χεῖρά σου

Thus it seems plausible that the plural is required by the Georgian idiom and no connection with the Lucianic text is needed. The Lucianic recension prefers to have “hands” in the plural in this and similar expressions,⁴⁹ and this suggests that in *L* the plural is recensional.

⁴⁹ In the Books of Kingdoms, there are three similar cases: 1 Kgs 18:9 δίδως τὸν δοῦλόν σου εἰς χεῖρα Ἀχααβ (Brooke-McLean: χεῖρα B E S] χεῖρας AN om), 21(20):28 καὶ δώσω τὴν δύναμιν τὴν μεγάλην ταύτην εἰς χεῖρα σὴν (χεῖρα σην] χεῖρας σου Zbo_c₂e₂ A: χεῖρας ιῆλ N), and 22:15 καὶ δώσει κύριος εἰς χεῖρα τοῦ βασιλέως (εἰς χεῖρα B] ἐν χειρὶ bo_c₂e₂ Thdt: εἰς χεῖρας AN rel).

Georg. 15,3 filii autem Israelis, victores (facti) per Davidem, conculcabant castra eorum

Arm. § 94 David autem et filii Israel conculcabant castra eorum

17:53 סָשַׁבְתִּים וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל καὶ κατεπάτουν τὰς παρεμβολὰς αὐτῶν

κατεπάτουν Hipp *Georg. 15,3 Arm. § 94 (conculcabant)*] προενόμευσαν *L* 554^{mg}: cf. MT

Hexaplaric: κατεπάτουν] λ' διήρπασαν 243.

Cf. 23:1 διαρπάζουσιν] α' προνομεύουσιν 243(Field: σ') 731(s nom)

The marginal reading in 554 is without attribution and Field provides no additional material for this verse. However, in 1 Sam 23:1 προνομεύω is Aquila's⁵⁰ equivalent for סָשַׁב (it is the rendering of the LXX in Judg 2:14, 16; Isa 10:13, 13:16, and 17:14). Brock assumes that in 17:53 προενόμευσαν comes likewise from Symmachus.⁵¹ Be that as it may, both versions of *De David et Goliath* undoubtedly attest κατεπάτουν of the B text against *L*.⁵²

3.3 Conclusion

Even a quick glance at the complete text of the biblical quotations in *De David et Goliath* reveals that its most distinct textual trait is freedom of quotation and/or the Georgian and Armenian translations (see Appendix A). This often makes it extremely hazardous or impossible to determine which reading Hippolytus attests.

When Hippolytus' attestation appears to be clear he follows the main LXX text tradition – in Brock's words – “in the vast majority of cases.”⁵³ A couple of examples of this have been provided in the analysis:⁵⁴

17:33 καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνὴρ Hipp *Georg. 10,2*] αὐτὸς δὲ ἀνὴρ ἐστὶ (> 82 Chr) *L* Chr

⁵⁰ It is marked with α' in MS 731 according to “Sammlung hexaplarischer Noten.” Field attributes the reading to Symmachus. Reider/Turner, *An Index to Aquila*, do not mention προνομεύω as a correspondence to סָשַׁב.

⁵¹ This is while discussing the reading διαρπάζουσιν in 23:1, which he considers an approximation. Brock, *Recensions*, 164: “Josephus ... seems to have known this approximation, and again at xvii 53 ... where, however, the approximation has not survived in the LXX ms tradition (although *L* z^{mg} Co^w have yet another approximation, προενόμευσαν = σ', there; ...).”

⁵² Thus also Brock, *Recensions*, 201.

⁵³ Brock, *Recensions*, 201.

⁵⁴ In order to keep the conclusions short, in the following only the gist of the textual data is provided. The lemma is Rahlfs. Only *L* is cited constantly. For the full data the reader should look back to the analysis part of the chapter.

17:53 κατεπάτουν Hipp Georg. 15,3 Arm. § 94 (*conculcabant*)] προενόμευσαν
L 554^{mg}: cf. MT

However, the text-critical value of *De David et Goliath* is seen in two (counting five parallel cases as one) readings in which Hippolytus and *L* attest the original reading:

17:35 ἐπάταξα 1^ο] ἐπάτασσον L⁽⁻¹⁹⁾ 158 554 Hipp Arm. 11,1; > Hipp Georg.
11,1
ἐξέσπασα] ἐξέσπων O L⁽⁻¹⁹⁾ 158 554 Hipp Georg. Arm. 11,1 (*eruebam* [litt.
proferebam] Georg.; *eripiebam* Arm.)
ἐκράτησα] ἐκράτουν L 158 318 Chr Hipp Georg. Arm. 11,1 (*attingebam*
Georg.; *apprehendebam* Arm.)
ἐπάταξα 2^ο] ἐπάτασσον L 158 318; *suffocabam* Hipp Georg. 11,1; > Hipp Arm.
11,1
ἐθανάτωσα] ἐθανάτουν L 68' 158 318 Hipp Arm. 11,1; > Hipp Georg.

17:36 καὶ τὸν λέοντα B CII a b s] ante καὶ 1^ο tr rel Hipp Georg. Arm. 11,1 =
MT

In the following instance there seems to be a true agreement between Hippolytus and *L* in a secondary reading. The reading is probably an early variant (attested by Theodotion):

17:37 χειρός 1^ο] στόματος (pr τοῦ 554) L 55 158 554 Sa Tht I Reg. 565 Hipp
Georg. 11,1; θ' στόματος 243-731(s nom)

Of the six agreements between Hipp Arm. and *L* suggested by Brock, one attests the original reading (the imperfects in 17:35). On close analysis, five have proven to be apparent or, at best, coincidental (17:5):

17:5 περικεφαλαία] + χαλκῇ L CI 55 158 318 554 (+ χαλκῇ post αὐτοῦ 1^ο
245^S) Ge^L; + *aeris* (*rvalisay* 'bronze' T; *spilenjisay* 'copper' J)
Hipp Georg. 6 7,10; + *aerea* Hipp Arm. 7,10 (Vg.)

17:8 τί] ἵνα τί L CII s 55 554; *quare* Hipp Georg. 6; *cur* Hipp Arm. § 49

17:8 πολέμῳ] pr ἐν 245; πόλεμον V CII a s 158 707; εἰς πόλεμον L d 554;
(*venitis*) *ad-bellandum* Hipp Georg. 6; (*egredimini aciem-struere*) *in bellum*
Hipp Arm. § 49

17:34 καὶ (3^ο)] ἧ (ἡ 19) L 509 125 158 460 554 Hipp Georg. Arm. 11,1

17:43 ὥσεί] μή L 318 554^c Ge^{DSL}; *nonne* (et tr post *canis*) Hipp Georg. 13,1;
num Hipp Arm. 13,1; > Ge^J

The analysis of *Georg.* has revealed nine additional instances of agreement that are apparent or coincidental (17:33, 45, 46) :

17:2 συνάγονται] συνήχθησαν *L Ge* (aorist) \approx *congregati sunt Hipp Georg. 6;*
(*Israel*) *congregatus est Hipp Arm. § 39* (past tense)

17:4 ἐκ (1^ο) *Hipp Georg. 7,4 Arm. 7,4]* + παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ *L 245^S; + gente*
Hipp Georg. 6

17:4 τῆς (> *a*) παρατάξεως (παρεμβολῆς 318) *Hipp Georg. 7,4 Arm. 7,4 (acie)]*
> *Ge^J Hipp Georg. 6; gente Ge^{DOS}*

17:8 τί] ἵνα τί *L CII s 55 554; quare Hipp Georg. 6; cur Hipp Arm. § 49*

17:33 παιδάριον εἶ / σύ *Hipp Arm. 10,4]* tr *L 158 Ge^{DOSJL} Chr Hipp Georg.*
10,2

17:34 τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ / ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ] tr *L⁻¹⁹ 158 554 Chr; ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ*
πρὸς αὐτοῦ 19; oves patris sui Hipp Georg. Arm. 11,1

17:43 καὶ εἶπεν Δαυιδ οὐχὶ ἄλλ' ἢ χεῖρῳ κυνός *Hipp Arm. 13,1]* > *A O L Ge^{FOJ}*
Hipp Georg. 13,1 = MT (Omission in *Georg. e silentio.*)

17:45 πορεύομαι] ἔρχομαι *L Ast Chr Tht; venio Hipp Georg. Arm. 13,2* (Both
Georg. and *Arm.* may follow their own pattern)

17:46 τὴν χεῖρα (ἐν + dat. *A*) *Hipp Arm. 13,2]* τὰς χεῖράς *L 121 245 Tht Hipp*
Georg. 13,2 (Plural needed by Georgian idiom)

4 Irenaeus

4.1 Prolegomena

Irenaeus (Iren) became the bishop of Lyon in 178 CE. His famous work *Against Heresies* (*Haer.*) is “the first complete and systematic exposition of an anti-Gnostic understanding of Christian faith.”¹ The Greek text survives only in fragments, but the Latin translation (late fourth century) is complete, and a literal translation into Armenian is available for books 4 and 5.² The date of the Latin translation and its possible relation to the OL version(s) of the LXX are debated issues.³

Augustine refers to the Latin version of *Against Heresies* (*Contra Julianum* I,3) in 421 CE which sets the *terminus ante quem* of the translation. According to B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, A. Souter, and Hermann Jordan the vocabulary and syntax point to a late fourth century dating.⁴ W. Sanday and C.H. Turner, on the other hand, maintained that the “late” nature of the language can be explained by the nature of Christian Latin⁵ and the subject matter of the text. Moreover, it could be argued that the lack of standardized theological vocabulary suggests rather a third century dating.⁶ Hort and Souter suggested that the translator used more or less consistently an existing Latin Bible in rendering the New Testament quotations.⁷ Hermann Jordan, however, studied the Old Testament quotations as well and he concluded that most of the time the trans-

¹ Kannengiesser, *Patristic Exegesis*, 477.

² Kannengiesser, *Patristic Exegesis*, 478.

³ I have treated the following issues in somewhat more detail in my article: T. Kauhanen, “Irenaeus and the Text of 1 Samuel”, *VT* 59 (2009), 415–28.

⁴ B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction* (Cambridge, 1882), 160; A. Souter, “The Date and Place of the Latin Translation of Irenaeus”, in *Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei* (ed. W. Sanday and C.H. Turner; Oxford: Clarendon, 1923), lxxv–lxxvi; H. Jordan, “Das Alter und die Herkunft der lateinischen Übersetzung des Hauptwerkes des Irenaeus”, in *Theologische Studien: Theodor Zahn dargebracht* (Leipzig, 1908), 183, 187.

⁵ On the definition of ‘Christian Latin’, see A. Blaise, *Manuel du latin chrétien* (Strasbourg, 1955), 11–14.

⁶ W. Sanday, “The Date of the Latin Irenaeus: A Fragment”, in *Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei*, lxxiv; C.H. Turner, preface to *Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei*, p. xxiv. The situational considerations, on the other hand, seem to point to a late dating. These considerations are treated in detail by Jordan, “Das Alter und die Herkunft”, 139–41, and summarized in English by Souter, “The Date and Place”, lxxvii: “If it [= the translation] was not produced within twenty years of the original, it is less likely to have been produced about 250, at which time the Gnostic heresies were practically dead. With the beginning of the fourth century men began to fall back more and more on the earliest teachers of the Church ... [Jordan] sees in the Priscillianist heresy an occasion for the preparation and issue of a translation of Irenaeus.”

⁷ Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 159–60. A. Souter, “The New Testament Text of Irenaeus”, in *Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei*, cxxvi and cxxxix.

lator treats the quotations in the same word-for-word manner as the other parts of the text.⁸ This conclusion was also reached by John Chapman, according to whom the cases in which Old Latin influence on the translator could be demonstrated are very few and easily explained as mistakes in the manuscripts of the translation.⁹

According to Sven Lundström, the translator aimed at a slavishly word-for-word translation.¹⁰ Despite the word-for-word method, there is some variation of translation equivalents. According to Lundström, nearly always when there are synonymous or nearly synonymous words in the Greek text there is variation in the Latin also, but variation in the Latin does not necessarily point to variation in the Greek.¹¹

The translator's faithfulness to his original in rendering Bible quotations is easily illustrated by chapter 19 of Book 1, for which both the Greek and Latin texts are available. In this passage it is not always certain whether Irenaeus is quoting the Bible as he knew it or as he claims the Marcosians to have quoted it. The translator, however, aims at a faithful rendering even if the quotation is strongly adapted to the context. For example, Irenaeus writes:

[T]he words of the prophet Isaiah: *But Israel does not know me, and the people do not understand me*, they adapt to refer to the ignorance about the invisible Profundity. Also the passage of Hosea: *There is no truth in them and there is no knowledge of God*, they violently stretch to mean the same thing. (1,19,1)¹²

In the following Irenaeus' Greek and Latin texts are compared with the LXX passages in question.

*Isaiah 1:3 and Hosea 4:1 in Iren. Haer. 1,19,1*¹³

Iren (Latin)	Iren (Greek)	LXX (Göttingen)	Cf. Cyp <i>Test.</i> 3,47 ¹⁴
Prophetam igitur Esaiam dicentem: <i>Israel autem me non cognovit et populus me non intellexit,</i> inuisibilis Bythi	Τὸν γοῦν προφήτην Ἑσαΐαν εἰπόντα· Ἰσραὴλ δέ με οὐκ ἔγνω, καὶ ὁ λαὸς με οὐ συνῆκε, τὴν τοῦ ἀοράτου Βυθοῦ	Isaiah 1:3 Ἰσραὴλ δέ με οὐκ ἔγνω, καὶ ὁ λαὸς με οὐ συνῆκεν.	

⁸ Jordan, "Das Alter und die Herkunft", 183, 187.

⁹ J. Chapman, "Did the Translator of St Irenaeus Use a Latin N.T.?", *RB* 36 (1924), 34–5, 36–43, 49–50.

¹⁰ S. Lundström, *Studien zur lateinischen Irenäusübersetzung* (Lund: Ohlsson, 1943), 15.

¹¹ Lundström, *Studien*, 84. A set of examples may be found in Jordan, "Das Alter und die Herkunft", 182, n. 1.

¹² Translation: D.J. Unger/J.J. Dillon, trans., *St. Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies* (ACW 55; New York / Mahwah, 1992), 75.

¹³ Edition: A. Rousseau et al. (ed.), *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, livre I: Tome II: Texte et traduction* (SC 264; Paris, 1979).

¹⁴ The Beuron Vetus Latina database (used online in Brepolis databases: <http://www.brepolis.net>) does not contain any other Latin quotations from this passage that differ from the LXX text.

ignorantiam dixisse coaptant.	ἀγνωσίαν εἰρηκέναι μεθαρμόζουσι.		
Et in Osee quod dictum est: <i>Non est in eis <u>ueritas</u> <u>neque agnitio</u> <u>Dei</u></i> , in hoc idem tendere conantur.	Καὶ διὰ Ὡσηὲ τὸ εἰρημένον· Οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀλήθεια , οὐδὲ ἐπίγνωσις Θεοῦ , εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ συντεί- νειν βιάζονται.	Hosea 4:1 διότι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια οὐδὲ ἔλεος οὐδὲ ἐπίγνωσις θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	Apud oseae: ... <i>neque misericor- dia neque <u>ueritas</u> <u>neque agnitio dei</u> sit super terram</i>

The Isaiah quotation follows the LXX¹⁵ word for word, and the translator proceeds word for word also. In the Hosea quotation, by contrast, the words ἐν αὐτοῖς are added before the word ἀλήθεια, and the words οὐδὲ ἔλεος are omitted.¹⁶ The translator, however, treats this inaccurate quotation in the same manner as the rest of the text. The faithful rendering of such an inaccurate quotation¹⁷ strongly points to the conclusion that in this passage no Bible text – Latin or Greek – was consulted by the translator.¹⁸

Near the end of the chapter, Irenaeus refers to the words addressed to Daniel by “the man clothed in linen”:

Likewise, Daniel signified this same thing when, as one who did not know, he asked the angel for an explanation of the parables. Moreover, the angel, hiding from him the great mystery of Profundity, said to him: *Go, Daniel, for the words are sealed up until those who are intelligent understand, and those who are white are made white.* And they boast that they themselves are the ones who are white and quite intelligent. (1,19,2)¹⁹

In the following Irenaeus’ Greek and Latin texts are compared with the text of Daniel in both the LXX and Theodotion.

¹⁵ There are only minor variants in the Göttingen apparatus (J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta: Vetus testamentum graecum. Auctoritate Academiae scientiarum Gottingensis editum: vol XIV: Isaias* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983]).

¹⁶ Again, no significant variants are found in the apparatus (J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta: Vetus testamentum graecum. Auctoritate Academiae scientiarum Gottingensis editum: vol XIII: Duodecim prophetae* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984]).

¹⁷ To be sure, Irenaeus does claim that the Marcosians “constrain” (βιάζονται) the Hosea passage “to refer to the ignorance about the invisible Profundity.” Irenaeus probably means that his opponents were adapting the passage in a wrong way, not that they were twisting the words of the Bible. It is hard to argue that one of the quotations in this passage of *Against Heresies* is meant to be straight from the Bible and the other a Marcosian modification. I find it improbable that Irenaeus’ translator would have noticed any such distinction either.

¹⁸ As for Cyprian, in his quotation the words ‘truth’ and ‘mercy’ are transposed, but otherwise he follows the LXX text. The Latin texts do have one thing in common, though: the word *agnitio* as an equivalent of ἐπίγνωσις. The rest of the Latin Bible quotations (Aug *Spec.* 11; Benedict of Aniane [d. 821], *Concordia Regularum*; Ferréol of Uzès [d. 581], *Regula ad monachos*; Cyp *Demetr.* 9) have *scientia*, as does the Vulgate. The choice of *agnitio* by Irenaeus’ translator may have been influenced by an Old Latin version, also known to Cyprian, even if that version was not systematically used in making the translation.

¹⁹ Translation: Unger/Dillon, *Against the Heresies*, 75–6.

Daniel 12:9–10 in Iren. Haer. 1,19,2²⁰

Iren (Lat)	Iren (Gk)	LXX (Göttingen)	Theodotion (Göttingen)
Sed et angelum abscondentem ab eo magnum mys- terium Bythi dicere ei: <i>Recurre, Danihel; hi enim sermones obstructi sunt, quoadusque intellectores intellegant et albi inalbentur:</i>	Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ἄγγελον ἀποκρυπτόμενον ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τὸ μέγα μυστήριον τοῦ Βυθοῦ, εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ· Ἀπότρεχε Δανιήλ· οὗτοι γὰρ οἱ λόγοι ἐμπεφραγμένοι εἰσὶν, ἕως οἱ συνιέντες συνιῶσι , καὶ οἱ λευκοὶ λευκανθῶσι .	καὶ εἶπέν μοι Ἀπότρεχε, Δανιηλ, ὅτι κατακεκαλυμμέ- να καὶ σφραγισμένα τὰ προστάγματα, ἕως ἂν πειρασθῶσι καὶ ἀγιασθῶσι πολλοί, καὶ ἀμάρτωσιν οἱ ἀμαρτωλοὶ· καὶ οὐ μὴ διανοηθῶσι πάντες οἱ ἀμαρτω- λοὶ, καὶ οἱ διανοοῦ- μενοι προσέξουσιν.	καὶ εἶπεν Δεῦρο, Δανιηλ, ὅτι ἐμπεφραγμένοι καὶ ἐσφραγισμένοι οἱ λόγοι, ἕως καιροῦ πέρας· ἐκλεγῶσιν καὶ ἐκλευκανθῶσιν καὶ πυρωθῶσιν πολλοί, καὶ ἀνομήσωσιν ἄνομοι· καὶ οὐ συνήσουσιν πάντες ἄνομοι, καὶ οἱ νοήμονες συνήσουσιν.
(et seipsos esse albos et intellec- tores gloriantur.)	(καὶ αὐτοὺς εἶναι τοὺς λευκοὺς καὶ εὐσυνιέντας αὐχοῦσι.)		

The vocabulary (ἀπότρεχε, οἱ λόγοι ἐμπεφραγμένοι, συνιήμι, λευκαίνω) suggests that the allusion is contamination of both the LXX and the Theodotion text. Whether the allusion is actually drawn from some Gnostic source or formulated by Irenaeus himself,²¹ the translator has evidently treated it like the actual quotations earlier in chapter 19 and translated it word for word.

The above observations strongly suggest that Jordan’s and Chapman’s conclusions that Irenaeus’ translator did not consult a Latin Bible when rendering the New Testament quotations is valid for the Old Testament quotations as well. I also agree with Chapman that, as soon as it is established that Old Latin influence on the translator is not probable, the question of the date of the translation becomes inconsequential.²²

²⁰ Rousseau et al. (ed.), *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les heresies, livre I*.

²¹ That Irenaeus meant the quotation to be understood as something the Marcosians claimed the Bible to say is suggested in the notes of Unger and Dillon’s translation (*Against the Heresies*, 221). The strongest thing pointing to this is the use of the term βυθός ‘Profundity,’ “one of [the] primary elements in [the] Nicolaitan doctrine of Creation” (Lampe, ad loc.). The term is not mentioned in the Daniel passage, and, accordingly, Irenaeus could hardly have claimed himself that the Profundity was just the thing that was hidden from Daniel.

²² See Chapman, “Did the Translator”, 49. Lundström, *Studien*, 94, n. 7, refers to Chapman’s view of the Old Latin usage with some approval.

However, one should not overemphasize the slavishness of the translation; the Latin version contains modifications that are best attributed to the translator. The balancing between slavishness and freedom is also seen in the Bible quotations and Irenaeus himself is not 100% accurate in his quotations. Accordingly, regardless of the exact dating of the translation, the (actual) biblical quotations in it must be assumed to witness the Bible as Irenaeus knew it. Although it is a secondhand witness, the Latin *Against Heresies* is a reliable witness to a second-century Bible text.

Irenaeus' quotations from 1 Samuel have been discussed by Henry Voogd and Sebastian Brock.²³ Voogd adopted the division between "Afra" and "Itala" texts for the OL versions and placed the Latin *Against Heresies* in the "Afra" group for two reasons: (1) Jordan's and Souter's studies suggest that the translation was made in Africa.²⁴ (2) The quotations from 1 Samuel seem to coincide with "other Afra texts." Voogd's over-all conclusion concerning the African fathers is that they represent the Lucianic text tradition thus furnishing "independent evidence of an Ur-Lucianic source."²⁵ That Voogd supposed that this conclusion holds true for Irenaeus as well is at least partly based on the fact that he did not use the Armenian evidence for *Against Heresies* (of which see below). Because of this shortcoming, Voogd's assessments of the readings are often not reliable. It will be seen in the course of analysis that the agreement between Irenaeus and *L* is much rarer than Voogd maintained and that the nature of the actual agreements can be explained by means other than supposing an "Ur-Lucianic source."

Brock's conclusion about the relationship between Irenaeus and *L* is very different from Voogd's. According to him, "[i]n most of the instances ... there is a strong possibility" that the agreement is nothing more than agreement in the original reading. When, on the other hand, Irenaeus goes against *L* the latter gives obviously secondary readings.²⁶ While some details in Brock's analysis of the readings may be refined, his overall conclusions about Irenaeus' text-historical position are certainly correct – this will be seen in the discussion below.

The fourth book of *Against Heresies* contains two quotations from 1 Samuel. The text is edited in SC 100,²⁷ which contains the Latin version (Iren *Lat.*) with an apparatus, a separate apparatus for Armenian variants reproduced in Latin (Iren *Arm.*),²⁸ and a Greek text reconstructed by the editor.²⁹ When

²³ H. Voogd, "A Critical and Comparative Study of the Old Latin Texts of the First Book of Samuel" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1947), 23–5. Brock, *Recensions*, 202.

²⁴ Jordan, "Das Alter und die Herkunft", 192; Souter, "The Date and Place", xcvi.

²⁵ Voogd, "Old Latin Texts", 25, 200–1. For the definition of the term see p. 102: "The term Ur-Lucian in this dissertation signifies an Old Greek text apparently revised on the basis of the Syrian or Antiochian Hebrew text tradition."

²⁶ Brock, *Recensions*, 203–4.

²⁷ A. Rousseau et al. (ed.), *Irénée de Lyon. Contre les Hérésies. Livre IV. Tome I: Introduction, notes justificatives, tables. Tome II: Texte et traduction* (SC 100:1–2; Paris: Cerf, 1965).

²⁸ Brock has used Ter-Minassiantz's edition of the Armenian translation: E. Ter-Minassiantz (ed.), *Irenaeus: Gegen die Häretiker: Elenchos kai anatropē tēs pseudōnymou gnōseōs: Buch IV u. V: In*

both Iren *Lat.* and Iren *Arm.* agree I will refer to the readings by the simple ‘Iren’ without qualifications.

In the discussion below, Irenaeus’ full quotation with some lines of context is given. If there is a variant in the Armenian version that agrees with the Greek texts, it is given in square brackets – otherwise the significant readings of the apparatuses of SC are in the footnotes. The part of the Latin text that seems to be a direct quotation is given in italics, whereas the rest is in roman type. Bold type is used to bring out the differences between the texts. After the quotation there follows an analysis of the readings. The readings are given in an apparatus-like format. Often the apparatus is preceded by a few words of context from BHS and Rahlfs.

4.2 Analysis

4.2.1 *Against Heresies* 4,17,1 = 1 Sam 15:22

1 Sam 15:22 (Rahlfs)	Iren <i>Lat.</i> 4,17,1	1 Sam 15:22 (Ant)
καὶ εἶπεν Σαμουὴλ	Si quando enim neglegentes eos iustitiam et abstinentes a dilectione Dei videbat, per sacrificia autem et reliquas typicas observantias putantes propitiari Deum, dicebat eis Samuel quidem sic:	καὶ εἶπε Σαμουὴλ πρὸς Σαούλ
Εἰ θελήτῳ τῷ κυρίῳ ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ θυσίαι ὥς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι φωνῆς κυρίου; ἰδοὺ ἀκοὴ ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθὴ καὶ ἡ ἐπακρόασις ὑπὲρ στέαρ κριῶν	<i>Non vult deus</i> ³⁰ [<i>Arm.: Numquid vult dominus</i>] <i>holocausta et sacrificia, sed vult</i> [<i>Arm.: (magis) quam</i>] <i>exaudiri vocem suam</i> [<i>Arm.: domini</i>]. <i>Ecce auditus bonus super sacrificium</i> [<i>Arm.: pl.</i>] , <i>et auditus</i> [<i>Arm.: ἡ ἐπακρόασις</i>] <i>super adipem arietum.</i>	Ἴδοὺ οὐ θέλει Κύριος ὀλοκαυτώσεις καὶ θυσίας ὥς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ. ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀκοὴ ἀγαθὴ ὑπὲρ θυσίαν, καὶ ἀκρόασις ὑπὲρ στέαρ κριῶν

armenischen Version entdeckt von Lic. Dr. Karapet Ter-Mékérttschian (TU 35:2. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1910).

²⁹ These Greek readings reconstructed by Rousseau will be given in footnotes.

³⁰ The text of SC actually reads *Dominus*. The reading is taken from the apparatus, which states: “dominus ex arm.: deus lat.”

15:22 לִיהוָה הֲחִפָּץ בְּעֹלֹת וּבִזְבָּחִים וַיֹּאמֶר שָׁמוּהָל עַיִן תִּהְיֶה לְיְהוָה וְלֹא יִשְׁמָע וַיֹּאמֶר שָׁמוּהָל עַיִן תִּהְיֶה לְיְהוָה

εἰ (οὐ 376; μή 55*; η 158) θελητὸν τῷ κυρίῳ] ἰδοὺ οὐ θέλει κς *L* 554^{mg}
Tht *I* Reg. 561; *numquid vult dominus* Iren *Arm.* 4,17,1 Lucifer, *Reg.* 2: cf.
Vg.; *non vult deus* Iren *Lat.* 4,17,1³¹; *numquid vult deus* Spec. 29
Hexaplaric: μὴ θέλει 243(σ')-731 (s nom)³²

This forms a single variation unit since all the words in the readings above are more or less interdependent. The Hebrew sentence לִיהוָה הֲחִפָּץ בְּעֹלֹת וּבִזְבָּחִים “Has the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD?” (NRSV) no doubt forms a rhetorical question expecting a negative answer. The LXX translator had first to make a choice between retaining the question and changing it into a statement. If the reading with the particle εἰ is the original one, the translator decided to retain the question but leave the answer (“yes” or “no”) open. However, he could have used a negation also: although in 1 Samuel the translator renders the interrogative הָ with a negation only once elsewhere (21:16 הֲזֶה הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה οὗτος οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται), this rendering is found eleven times in 2 Samuel.³³ For a rhetorical question expecting a negative answer the translator should have used μή, but that reading is found in the present case only in 55* and Symmachus. To use οὐ would either turn the argument upside down – οὐ in a question expects a positive answer – or change the question to a statement. Thus the text form οὐ θελητὸν τῷ κυρίῳ in 376 is open to misunderstanding. In *L* 554^{mg}, however, the preceding ἰδοὺ makes the clause unambiguously a statement: “see, the Lord does not want ...” (about the verbal construction in *L*, see below). Accordingly, regarding only the formulation of the rhetorical question or the statement, there are four possibilities of readings: 1. εἰ makes the sentence unambiguously a question, but does not imply what the answer is. 2. οὐ (without ἰδοὺ) leaves open whether the sentence is a rhetorical question expecting a positive answer, or a negative statement. 3. With μή the sentence is best understood as a rhetorical question and the appropriate (negative) answer is expected. 4. ἰδοὺ οὐ makes the clause a statement that clears any possibility of misunderstanding. Possibilities 3 and 4 seem secondary: both could be explained as attempts to make the clause unambiguous, and they may well derive from the reading οὐ. Possibility 1 might be a Hebraizing correction: εἰ for η. Thus I very tentatively suggest that the correct particle here was indeed οὐ. It has been retained in

³¹ Rousseau reconstructs the Greek text as: εἰ θέλει ὁ Κύριος.

³² There are also a number of Hexaplaric readings in Tht *Schol.*: εἰ – fin] ο’ εἰ θελητὸν τῷ κυρίῳ ὀλοκαύτωμα καὶ θυσία ὡς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι φωνῆς κυρίου; ἰδοὺ ἀκοὴ ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθή, καὶ ἡ ἐπακρόασις ὑπὲρ στέαρ κριῶν; ἀ’ μὴ βούλημα τοῦ κυρίου ἐν ὀλοκαυτώμασι καὶ θυσίαις; ἰδοὺ ἀκοὴ παρὰ θυσίαν ἀγαθή, τὸ (τοῦ Fl^{ac}) προσέχειν παρὰ στέαρ κριῶν; σ’ μὴ θέλει (θέλη Fl, Petit: legendum) κύριος ἀναφοράς ὡς τὸ ὑπακοῦσαι τῆς φωνῆς κυρίου; ἡ γὰρ ὑπακοὴ βέλτιον (βελτίων Field; Petit: fors. legendum) θυσίας, τὸ προσέχειν ὑπὲρ στέαρ κριῶν Tht *Schol.* 33.

³³ The cases are: η : οὐ 2 Sam 7:5 (Tov-Polak: different Vorlage); η : μή 2 Sam 2:26, 3:8, 10:3, 12:23, 13:20, 14:19, 17:6, 19:22, 36, 43.

376³⁴ and, when the secondary ἰδοῦ is removed, in *L* 554^{mg}. The formulation by Iren *Lat.*, *non vult ... sed vult*, is certainly a statement – in all probability it also reflects Greek οὐ.³⁵

The next question is whether the original reading is θελητόν or θέλει. If it is the former, the translator read the corresponding Hebrew word as a noun as it is vocalized in the MT: רָפָה ‘delight, pleasure.’ In that case, the reading θέλει would be recensional: the word θελητός is very rare in the LXX³⁶ and to change a rare word to a more simple and usual expression could fit in the tendencies of the Lucianic recensor. On the other hand, the translator could have read the consonants יהוה רָפָה as a verbal clause (vocalizing רָפָה as a perfect: רָפָה) and bypassed the *lāmed* preceding the Tetragrammaton – or did not have a *lāmed* in his *Vorlage*. This could have resulted in the rendering θέλει for רָפָה.³⁷ Moreover, if θέλει is the original reading, κύριος is the subject and must be in the nominative case. In addition, the “burnt-offerings and sacrifices” should be read as objects of the verb and need to be in the accusative case. The reading ὁλοκαυτώματα in the majority is neuter, but the word θυσία has distinct nominative and accusative cases. It is very revealing that the accusative is found not only in *L* 554 but also in *B b d* (and in sg. in 247), even though these witnesses attest the reading θελητόν. On the basis of the above observations I offer the following scenario: the OG text form was (οὐ) θέλει κύριος ὁλοκαυτώσεις καὶ θυσίας. The same early Hebraizing correction as in the previous instance (εἰ for ἦ) changed θέλει to θελητόν to make it correspond to the noun רָפָה, and κύριος to τῷ κυρίῳ according to יהוה רָפָה. The word ὁλοκαύτωσις was changed to nominative and perhaps its gender was changed at the same time.³⁸ However, the word θυσίας was overlooked. This is the text form preserved in *B b d*. Later the copyists changed θυσίας to the appropriate case – the result is the majority text form adopted by Rahlfs in his edition. *L* retains the original form, but the recensor added ἰδοῦ in front of the clause in order to avoid misunderstanding of the clause as a rhetorical question. The reading *vult* in Iren *Lat.*, Lucifer, and *Speculum* likely reflects the original reading θέλει, but, on the other hand, it would be impossible in Latin to form an expression comparable to θελητός using the verb *volo*.³⁹

³⁴ This may be merely fortuitous: the reading of 376 might be a corruption from εἰ as well.

³⁵ Iren *Arm.* (in Rousseau’s Latin: *numquid vult ... [magis] quam*) on the other hand, retains the question and it could reflect a Greek reading with εἰ as well.

³⁶ The only other occurrence is θελητή in Mal 3:12

³⁷ A comparable case can be found in 1 Sam 18:25 where there is the verb βούλεται corresponding to רָפָה (no significant variants). Elsewhere in the LXX there are seven cases in which there is a verb in the LXX corresponding to רָפָה: 1 Kgs 10:13; Esth 6:9 (twice); Job 22:3, 31:16; Isa 46:10, 53:10.

³⁸ According to Brock, *Recensions*, 284, ὁλοκαύτωσις is the original word because it accords with the usage of the book elsewhere and ὁλοκαυτώματα is due to influence from the parallel passage in Hos 6:6. The reading holocausta in Iren *Lat.* may correspond to either Greek word.

³⁹ *Volo* is the appropriate verb when expressing the wish (practically a command) of a superior. It seems that Jerome wants to use this particular verb and arrives at a formulation (*numquid vult dominus*) that does not literally correspond to the Hebrew.

The reason for the change from *dominus* to *Deus* in Iren *Lat.* is best explained as conformation with the sentence preceding the quotation: *per sacrificia autem ... putantes propitiari Deum* “but they imagine they can appease God by sacrifices” (trans. mine). It is ‘God’, not ‘the Lord’, Irenaeus’ opponents are said to try to appease.

All in all, the connection between Irenaeus and *L* in the text form οὐ θέλει / *non vult* + subj. is best explained as agreement in the original form of the text. On the other hand, Irenaeus’ exact Greek wording remains somewhat uncertain due to the differences between the Latin and Armenian translations and the requirements of the sense and context of the quotation.⁴⁰

15:22 יהוה בקול כְּשִׁמְעַ וּזְבָחִים בְּעֻלּוֹת לַיהוה הִחֲפָץ εἰ θελητὸν τῷ κυρίῳ
ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ θυσίαι ὥς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι φωνῆς κυρίου

ὥς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι Iren *Arm.* 4,17,1] *sed vult exaudiri* Iren *Lat.* 4,17,1⁴¹; *magis quam exaudire* Luc *Reg.* 2 *Spec.* 29; *et non potius ut oboediatur* Vg.

This reading demonstrates Irenaeus’ translator’s desire to clarify the idea; as the Greek text rhetorically asks if the Lord wants “sacrifices as (much) as hearing” of his voice, Iren *Lat.* states that the Lord wants hearing and not sacrifices at all. None of the Latin witnesses approved with a slavish rendering of the Greek text.

15:22 κυρίου Iren *Arm.* 4,17,1 (*domini* = Luc *Reg.* 2 Vg.)] αὐτοῦ *L*
Tht *I Reg.* 561 Iren *Lat.* 4,17,1 (*suam*) *Spec.* 29

Rousseau reconstructs the Greek text of Irenaeus according to *Arm.* (κυρίου). If that is the correct choice, the agreement is not between Irenaeus and *L* but only between *L* and Iren *Lat.* The reading αὐτοῦ seems recensional: it is just what is expected, since *L* has above the verbal construction for θέλω and that makes κύριος the subject.⁴² If the *L*-reading is really recensional, the reading of Iren *Lat.* is best explained as free adaptation motivated by the requirements of style.

15:22 יהוה כְּשִׁמְעַ מְזָבַח טוֹב ἰδοὺ ἀκοή ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθή

ἰδοὺ Iren 4,17,1] pr καὶ 509; > Sa; + γάρ *L* Tht *I Reg.* 561

⁴⁰ Brock, *Recensions*, 203 classifies this reading under “Iren-lat-arm = LXX against *L*”.

⁴¹ Rousseau reconstructs the Greek text as: ἢ τὸ ἀκοῦσαι.

⁴² To be sure, the translator now and then chooses a pronoun when there is a noun – especially a proper noun – in Hebrew. This happens for דוד in: 18:25, 21:2; for שאול: 10:14, 14:50, 24:6, 26:12, 28:13; for שמואל: 19:24; for יהוה: 2:10; for עלי: 1:3; for פלשתי: 4:1 (diff. Vorlage?), 4:10, 17:51, 52. It might even be that some of these proper nouns are added in the MT and in those cases the LXX is following a *Vorlage* with just a pronoun or a suffix.

ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθή 247 C' f 64' 130-314-489 29 55 71 554] ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθήν A B V 376 a b d 92-488 158 244 245 318 460 707; ἀγαθή ὑπὲρ θυσίαν L Tht I Reg. 561 Iren Lat. 4,17,1 (*bonus super sacrificium*); *melior est enim oboedientia quam victimae* Vg.⁴³

The expression טוֹב מִזְבֵּחַ שְׁמַע in the MT most likely means “obedience is better than a sacrifice,” rather than “obedience [is better] than a *good* sacrifice” (taking טוב as an attribute to זֶבֶח as A, B, and their companions do). Rahlfs’ solution about the OG is probably correct.⁴⁴

Rousseau reconstructs Irenaeus’ Greek text according to Rahlfs (ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθή). At the least, Irenaeus undoubtedly reflects the understanding “hearing is better than a sacrifice” rather than “hearing [is better] than a good sacrifice.” The question of the word order is more complex. The construction ὑπέρ + acc. in comparative sense is not found in classical Greek; the first examples that LSJ gives are from the LXX. The situation is similar with the Latin *super* + acc. used in the sense of ‘more than’ (normally *plus quam* / *amplius quam*): it appears only in late Latin (the first examples that Lewis-Short gives are from the Vulgate). Accordingly, in Greek the expression appears to be a Hebraism and in pre-Vulgate Latin a Septuagintism. Elsewhere in the LXX where the construction adj. – ὑπέρ + acc. appears the word order of the Hebrew is strictly followed.⁴⁵ Until 1 Sam 15:22 all the Hebrew occurrences are in the more prosaic word order adj. – מִן + noun/pronoun. Could the translator have followed the same word order here? If this is the case, and the *L*-reading the original LXX, the word order in the majority of the MSS (and in Theodoret’s quotations from ο’ and α’) could result from a pre-Hexaplaric Hebraizing correction. On the other hand, if the word order in *L* is recensional, it could be explained as reflecting the Lucianic reviser’s desire to conform the expression to the more frequent usage of this type of expression. Perhaps the reviser considered it better to eliminate the poetic features in this context – the same desire may be seen in the elimination of the rhetorical question εἰ θελήτων τῷ Κυρίῳ (see above). If this is correct, the attestation to the Lucianic word order in Iren Lat. is best explained as accidental – this would be in conformity with the reconstruction in SC.⁴⁶

⁴³ Hexaplaric: βελτίων θυσίας 108 (σ’) 243(s nom)-731(s nom); ο’ ἰδοὺ ἀκοή ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθή, καὶ ἡ ἐπακρόασις ὑπὲρ στέαρ κριῶν; α’ ἰδοὺ ἀκοή παρὰ θυσίαν ἀγαθή, τὸ (τοῦ Fl^{ac}) προσέχειν παρὰ στέαρ κριῶν; σ’ ἡ γὰρ ὑπακοή βέλτιον (βελτίων Field; Petit: fors. legendum) θυσίας, τὸ προσέχειν ὑπὲρ στέαρ κριῶν Tht Schol. 33.

⁴⁴ Thus also Brock, *Recensions*, 202.

⁴⁵ Adjective first: e.g. Judg [A] 16:30, Judg 11:25, 15:2, 18:26; Ruth 3:12, 4:15; 1 Sam 1:8, 9:2. Adjective last: e.g. 2 Sam 1:23; 1 Chr 11:21, 25.

⁴⁶ But differently Brock, *Recensions*, 202.

15:22 **לְהַקְשִׁיב מִחֶלֶב אֵילִים** καὶ ἡ ἐπακρόασις ὑπὲρ στέαρ κριῶν

ἢ ἐπακρόασις Iren *Arm.* 4,17,1] ἀκρόασις *O L Tht I Reg.* 561; *auditus* Iren *Lat.* 4,17,1; *obaudentia* La^M; *oboedientia* Luc *Reg.* 2; *audientia mandatorum* *Spec.* 29

While making the observation that this is the sole occurrence of the word ἑπακρόασις in the LXX, Brock suggests that ἀκρόασις is of Hexaplaric origin. According to him, this is suggested by support from *O* and the rendering ἀκρόασις for קשב in σ´ and θ´ at Isa 21:7.⁴⁷ If this is the case, it explains its attestation by *L*. According to Rousseau, Iren *Arm.* attests ἑπακρόασις. The reading *auditus* of Iren *Lat.*, however, might attest either of the Greek readings. Thus Irenaeus’ reading remains somewhat uncertain, but since *L* appears to attest a Hexaplaric reading, there probably is no contact between Irenaeus and *L* in this variation unit.

4.2.2 *Against Heresies* 4,26,4 = 1 Sam 12:2b–5

1 Sam 12:2b–5 (Rahlf's)

Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4

1 Sam 12: 2b-5 (Ant)

Quemadmodum Samuel, tot
annis iudicans populum et
sine ulla elatione ducatum
gerens super Israel, in fine
se purgabat dicens:

2 καὶ γὰρ ἰδοὺ διελέλυθα
ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἐκ νεότητός
μου καὶ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας
ταύτης.

*Ego conversatus sum
in conspectu vestro a **primo**
aetate mea usque **nunc**.*

2 καὶ ἐγὼ ἰδοὺ **ἀνέστραμμα**
ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἐκ νεότητός
μου καὶ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας
ταύτης.

3 ἰδοὺ ἐγώ, ἀποκρίθην
κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐνώπιον κυρίου
καὶ ἐνώπιον χριστοῦ
αὐτοῦ· μόσχον τίνος
εἴληφα ἢ ὄνον τίνος
εἴληφα ἢ τίνα
κατεδυνάστευσα ὑμῶν ἢ
τίνα ἐξεπίεσα
ἢ ἐκ χειρὸς τίνος
εἴληφα ἐξίλασμα καὶ
ὑπόδημα;

*Respondite **mih**i [adversus
me] in conspectu Domini⁴⁸
et in conspectu Christi
ejus: Cujus **vestrum** vitu-
lum accepi aut asinum?
aut **super quem potentatus**
sum? aut quem oppressi?
aut si de **alicujus** manu
accepi propitiationem uel
calceamentum.*

3 ἰδοὺ ἐγώ, ἀποκρίθῃτε
κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐνώπιον Κυρίου
καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ χριστοῦ
αὐτοῦ· μόσχον τίνος ὑμῶν
εἴληφα; ἢ ὄνον τίνος
εἴληφα; ἢ τίνα ὑμῶν
καταδεδυνάσ-τευκα; ἢ τίνα
ἐξεπίασα ὑμῶν; ἢ ἐκ χειρὸς
τίνος ὑμῶν εἴληφα
ἐξίλασμα ἢ ὑπόδημα, καὶ
ἀπέκρυσα τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς

⁴⁷ Brock, *Recensions*, 259. According to Reider-Turner, Aquila has ἀκροᾶσθαι for רָאָה־שָׁמָע. The Greek word is not found in the actual Greek-Hebrew index.

⁴⁸ Domini ex arm.; dei lat.

adopted the verb ἀναστρέφω while retaining the perfect tense. Accordingly, διελήλυθα is the original reading.

Which reading does Irenaeus attest? At first glance it seems certain that *converso* is an equivalent of ἀναστρέφω.⁵² The semantic fields of διέρχομαι and *converso* overlap very little, and the Greek verb is never translated by *converso* in the Vulgate in the NT. Irenaeus' testimony may, however, be ambiguous: Brock observes the fact that in Ter-Minassiantz's edition there appears to be a doublet in Armenian: *gnac'eal šrjeal em*.⁵³ According to Brock, this would correspond to a hypothetical Greek reading διελήλυθα ἀνέστραμμαι. For this reason Brock does not accept Irenaeus as "a definite witness to *L* here".⁵⁴

12:2 הָיָה לִּי מִנְעָרִי עַד-הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה ἐκ νεότητός μου καὶ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης

ἐκ νεότητός μου] *a primo aetate mea* Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4

This special reading of Iren *Lat.* is probably just freedom of translation.

12:2 καὶ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης] *usque nunc* Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4 (Rousseau: = ἕως τοῦ νῦν)

The expected translation for καὶ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης could perhaps be *usque in hunc diem*. Since this expression is found in Iren *Lat.* (3,12,2: *et sepulchrum eius [=David] sit apud eos usque in hunc diem*, but this is not a biblical quotation), it is not something the translator preferred not to use. Rousseau reconstructs Irenaeus' Greek text as ἕως τοῦ νῦν. It is best to accept Rousseau's reconstruction for Irenaeus' text, but there is hardly any variant reading of the LXX behind it. Together with the previous variation unit this reading demonstrates an occasional freedom of quotation by Irenaeus.

The major textual problem in verses 3–4 concerns the number of the personal pronouns ὑμῶν and ἡμῶν. The text is quoted here with the MT.

⁵² In B. Reynders' Latin-Greek index to Irenaeus *conversor* and *convertito* do not correspond to διέρχομαι (CSCO 142, 70), although *conversor* is given as corresponding to the Greek verb in the Greek-Latin index (CSCO 141, 59). However, *conversor* is given as a correspondent to ἀναστρέφω in 345,8 (Reynder's numbering is following the edition by W.W. Harvey (ed.), *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis libri quinque adversus haereses* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1857]; I could not locate this instance in SC 294). Cf. Tertullian's systematic employment of a Latin verb with the basic verb *verto* as an equivalent for Greek verbs with the main verb στρέφω (p. 95).

⁵³ Ter-Minassiantz, *Irenaeus*, 88. In Ter-Minassiantz's edition the passage is 4,XLI,2, which is the same division that Brock uses. This Armenian variant is not mentioned in SC and Rousseau reconstructs Irenaeus' Greek text following Rahlfs.

⁵⁴ Brock, *Recensions*, 202. Differently Voogd, "Old Latin Texts", 23.

1 Sam 12:3–4 (MT)	1 Sam 12:3–4 (Rahlfs)	Iren <i>Lat.</i> 4,26,4	1 Sam 12:3–4 (Ant)
אֶת־שׁוֹר מִי לָקַחְתִּי וְחִמּוֹר מִי לָקַחְתִּי וְאֶת־מִי עָשִׂיתִי	μόσχον τίνος εἴληφα ἢ ὄνον τίνος εἴληφα ἢ τίνα κατεδυνάστευσα ὑμῶν	<i>Cujus vestrum vitulum accepi aut asinum? aut super quem potentatus sum?</i>	μόσχον τίνος ὑμῶν εἴληφα; ἢ ὄνον τίνος εἴληφα; ἢ τίνα ὑμῶν καταδεδυνάστευκα; ἢ τίνα ἐξεπίασα ὑμῶν; ἢ ἐκ χειρὸς τίνος ὑμῶν εἴληφα ἐξίλασμα ἢ ὑπόδημα, ...
אֶת־מִי רְצוֹתִי וּמִי־דָמִי לָקַחְתִּי כֶּפֶר ...	ἢ τίνα ἐξεπίασα ἢ ἐκ χειρὸς τίνος εἴληφα ἐξίλασμα καὶ ὑπόδημα; ...	<i>aut quem oppressi? aut si de alicujus manu accepi propitiationem uel calceamentum,...</i>	...
וְלֹא־לָקַחְתָּ מִי־אִשׁ מִמּוֹמָהּ	... καὶ οὐκ εἴληφας ἐκ χειρὸς οὐδενὸς οὐδέν.	<i>... neque accepisti de manu cujusquam aliquid</i>	... καὶ οὐκ εἴληφας ἐκ χειρὸς οὐδενὸς ἡμῶν οὐδέν.

The following variation units are relevant for this problem.⁵⁵

12:3 μόσχον τίνος (pr ei et tr 125) Iren *Arm.* 4,26,4 (<vitulum> si cujus)]
μόσχον (pr η 19'; pr ei Compl) τίνος ὑμῶν L 55 Sa Chr *Hom.* 2 *Cor.* 11:1 8
Tht 1 *Reg.* 549; *cujus vestrum vitulum* Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4; *si vitulum alicuius*
Spec. 143 Ferrandus, *Epist.* 7,6; *utrum bovem cuiusquam* Vg.

12:3 κατεδυνάστευσα ὑμῶν] tr L Chr *Hom.* 2 *Cor.* 11:1 8 Tht 1 *Reg.* 549; om
ὑμῶν A O 44-125 f 245 707 = MT

12:3 ἐξεπίασα] + ὑμῶν L Chr *Hom.* 2 *Cor.* 11:1 8 Tht 1 *Reg.* 549

12:3 τίνος 3^o] + ὑμῶν L 554 Chr *Hom.* 2 *Cor.* 11:1 8 Tht 1 *Reg.* 549

12:4 οὐδενός] τίνος O 158: cf. MT; ὑμῶν 19' 125; ἡμῶν Compl; > 107-610; +
ἡμῶν L^{-19'}

The following table visualizes the patterns in each text. A minus of a pro-
noun is indicated by a blank cell.

⁵⁵ There are also the following readings: V. 3: εἴληφα 1^o ∩ 2^o O 799 71 121^{txt} 244 245 Tht 1 *Reg.* 549
| om τίνος εἴληφα 2^o d 554 | ἐκ – ὑπόδημα] υποδημα τίνος εἴληφα 44 | om ἐκ – τίνος 3^o 125 | ἐκ
χειρός] εκ O; > d^(-44.125) | V. 4: καί 4^o ∩ (5) 1^o 44 | om ἐκ χειρός 125 Sa | οὐδέν] ου[... 98-731; ου 379.

	μόσχον τίνος	κατεδυ- νάστευσα	τίνα ἐξεπίεσα	ἐκ χειρὸς τίνος	ἐκ χειρὸς οὐδενὸς
Iren	+ <i>vestrum</i>				
B-text		+ ὑμῶν			
Hexaplaric witnesses		om A O 44-125 <i>f</i> 245 707 <i>Spec.</i>			
L	+ ὑμῶν 55 Chr Tht Sa	pr ὑμῶν	+ ὑμῶν Chr Tht La ^M	+ ὑμῶν 554 Chr Tht	+ ἡμῶν

Looking at the big picture, the agreement between Irenaeus and *L* in having the pronoun (ὑμῶν/*vestrum*) after μόσχον τίνος does not seem at all striking. The variation is best explained if the OG translation is represented by the B-text: The translator has added ὑμῶν after κατεδυνάστευσα for whatever reason,⁵⁶ and the Hexaplaric tradition has omitted the first ὑμῶν to bring the text into quantitative conformity with the MT. Iren *Lat.* chooses to have *vestrum* right at the beginning of the sequence – which is understandable – while the *L*-text has the pronoun wherever possible. The phenomenon in *L* is very probably recensional, exhibiting the reviser’s desire to produce as clear a text as possible. Brock lists this variation unit under the category “Reading of Irenaeus uncertain”.⁵⁷ This is because Iren *Arm.* does not attest *vestrum*, and Rousseau’s reconstruction omits ὑμῶν accordingly. To conclude, no relationship between Irenaeus and *L* needs to be supposed.⁵⁸

12:3 מִי־תָשׁוּר מִי־עֲשָׂקָי הִן תִּינָא קַאֲטַעֲדֻנָאֲטַעֲסָא ὑμῶν

κατεδυνάστευσα (-κα C 29 55* 71 707; καταδεδυνάστευκα M 93-127 *f* 158 318 Tht 1 *Reg.* 549) ὑμῶν] > ὑμῶν A O 44-125 *f*245 707 = MT; ὑμῶν καταδεδυνάστευκα L Chr *Hom.* 2 *Cor.* 11:1 8 Tht 1 *Reg.* 549; *super quem potentatus sum* Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4⁵⁹; *si quempiam calumniatus sum* Vg.

⁵⁶ Although there is nothing corresponding to ὑμῶν after any of the expressions in the MT, it is not necessary to suppose מִי־עֲשָׂקָי or the like in the *Vorlage*. While מִי־עֲשָׂקָי might be tolerated after a verb (מִי־תָשׁוּר מִי־עֲשָׂקָי), it is hard to reconstruct מִי־עֲשָׂקָי after מִי־תָשׁוּר: the combination מִי־עֲשָׂקָי is not attested in the BHS.

⁵⁷ Brock, *Recensions*, 203.

⁵⁸ Similarly Voogd, “Old Latin Texts”, 23: “Agreement is of minor significance because ‘uestrum’ is implied by previous usage in same verse.”

⁵⁹ Rousseau reconstructs the underlying Greek text according to Rahlfs’ text.

⁶³ Brock, *Recensions*, 143, 146–7.

La^M *respondete contra me – et abscondam oculos meos in quo dicitis adversus me*

Ferrandus, *Epist.* 7,6 *respondete contra me – vel calciamentum respondete adversum me*

Vulgate *loquimini de – et contemnam illud hodie*

Samuel's call for an "answer" by the people עֲנוּ בִי appears only at the beginning of the verse in the MT, and at the end the MT has וְאַעֲלִים עֵינַי בוֹ "and turned my eyes away from him". According to McCarter, וְאַעֲלִים is a copying mistake from נַעֲלִים 'sandals', which he prefers as the original reading on the basis of the LXX reading ὑπόδημα.⁶⁴ Whatever the original Hebrew reading was, it is certain that the LXX does not reflect the verb עלם and it does reflect a verb of saying instead of 'my eyes'. The graphical similarity between עֵינַי בוֹ and עֲנוּ בִי suggests that these are the competing readings (or the original Hebrew had both).

Iren *Lat.* treats the expression ἀποκρίθητε κατ' ἐμοῦ somewhat freely: at the first occurrence the prepositional phrase κατ' ἐμοῦ is changed to a pronoun (*mihī*). It is improbable, however, that the Latin translator of Irenaeus would have changed the verb as easily: the formulation *respondite adversum/contra me* is legitimate in Latin.⁶⁵ Accordingly, if Irenaeus' translator faced the expression ἀποκρίθητε κατ' ἐμοῦ in his text, he could have translated it into Latin as *respondite adversum/contra me* (as in Ferrandus' text). That the agreement between Irenaeus and *L* is genuine is further suggested by the readings of Iren *Arm.*: *respondite adversum me* and *dicite adversum me* respectively.

There is no pattern in the Lucianic readings concerning the verbs of saying: this is the only example of an interchange of the verbs ἀποκρίνομαι and λέγω in *L* in all the four books of Kingdoms.⁶⁶ Moreover, the recensor left the phrase untouched in 1 Sam 14:39 and 2 Sam 1:16. The possibility that the *L*-reading εἶπατε κατ' ἐμοῦ was motivated by the Peshitta reading ܐܝܬܐܪܐ must be rejected: the Peshitta does not render the same Hebrew text as the LXX in this variation unit but follows the MT in וְאַעֲלִים עֵינַי בוֹ (וְאַעֲלִים עֵינַי בוֹ). The words ܐܝܬܐܪܐ are most likely just an explanatory addition by the Peshitta translator⁶⁷

⁶⁴ McCarter, *I Samuel*, 209–210.

⁶⁵ See, e.g., Titus Livius, *Ab urbe condita* 8,32,9; 33,35,12; 33,38,7; 35,50,1; Seneca, *De beneficiis* 6,13,4; 6,15,2; *De otio* 6,1; Virgil, *Aeneid* 6,20; Horace, *Satires* 2,3,233; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 9,2,93. It is also used by Christian authors, e.g.: Ambrose, *Exp. Luc.* 9,326; Augustine, *Pecc. merit.* 2,25,39; and Rufinus, *Apol. Hier.* 1,17; 2,12.

⁶⁶ The comparison is made between Rahlfs and Ant. There is, to be sure, one instance of λαλέω in *L* pro λέγω in Rahlfs, 1 Sam 10:25.

⁶⁷ C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 11; Boston: Brill, 2001), 125, 127. The reading is rightly treated in BHS as a plus compared to the MT. This is contrary to de Boer, who argues that "and I will pay back to you" is changed into ܐܝܬܐܪܐ to reject "the possibility of the offence" (P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text*

and do not reflect a Hebrew reading אָמַרְוּ בִי. Brock, too, suggests that the agreement is coincidental.⁶⁸

On closer examination, the reading εἶπατε κατ' ἐμοῦ actually has good merit to be the original reading: A little earlier the translator rendered עָנָה בִי with ἀποκρίθητε κατ' ἐμοῦ, but that does not mean that he could not use a different rendering here. The translator of 1 Samuel varies the equivalents he uses – even within the near context.⁶⁹ Moreover, elsewhere in the Septuagint there are seven cases in which עָנָה ‘to answer’ corresponds to λέγω.⁷⁰ It must be acknowledged, however, that in 1 Samuel the preferred rendering of עָנָה (in the sense of ‘answer’) is definitely ἀποκρίνομαι, whereas אָמַר is most often rendered with λέγω and never with ἀποκρίνομαι.⁷¹ Nevertheless, in this case there could be a reason for the translator to adopt a new equivalent: At the beginning of the verse Samuel invites the people to ‘testify’ against him: “Whose ox have I taken? Or whose donkey have I taken?” etc. The verb ἀποκρίνομαι seems to be appropriate here. After the questions, however, Samuel expects the people to *accuse*, and the translator may have thought that εἶπατε κατ' ἐμοῦ makes the meaning clearer. A pure desire for variety could also have motivated the change of the equivalent. There are, admittedly, quite a number of occurrences of the verb εἰπεῖν in the passage but a more common word certainly tolerates more repetition. Therefore it is not difficult to think that the translator chose a more frequent verb if he was not happy with the standard equivalent.

If εἶπατε κατ' ἐμοῦ is actually the original reading, the reading ἀποκρίθητε could result from a Hebraizing correction towards a reading עָנָה בִי. The problem with this explanation is that we have this Hebrew reading only as a retroversion of a Greek reading that we hold to be a correction towards the very same Hebrew reading! The graphic similarity with the MT, however, somewhat relieves this problem since the retroversion and the MT reading may be seen as each other's variants. While this solution is far from certain, it seems that the agreement between Irenaeus and *L* is best explained as an agreement in the original reading with *Speculum* and *La*^M against all the other witnesses.⁷²

of 1 Samuel I-XVI: A Contribution to the Study of the Books of Samuel [Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1938], 38). “And I will pay back to you” is, however, reflected in אָמַרְוּ בִי, a fact overlooked by de Boer.

⁶⁸ Brock, *Recensions*, 207, 210.

⁶⁹ Numerous examples will be found by anyone who compares the Greek and Hebrew texts of this book. Here a couple of examples with very usual words will suffice: אָנִישׁ (1:8, 11, 22, 23) / ἄνθρωπος (1:1, 3, 21); בּוֹא (4:12, 13) / εἰσερχομαι (4:13, 19); בֶּן (1:3, 4, 20, 23) / τέκνον (1:8, 2:5); הָלַךְ (3:6, 8, 9) / ἀναστρέφω (3:5, 9); דְּבַר (3:17 twice) / λόγος (3:17, 18, 19); רָאָה (9:17) / βλέπω (9:18); עָלָה (6:20) / ἀναβαίνω (6:20) / ἀνάγω (6:21).

⁷⁰ 2 Sam 14:19, 1 Kgs 13:6, Job 2:2, 23:5, 38:1; Dan (ו') 2:8, 6:21. In three of these cases (2 Sam, 1 Kgs, and Dan 6:21) Tov and Polak suggest אָמַר in the Vorlage (Tov-Polak ad loc.).

⁷¹ Although it seems that the translator never interchanges ἀποκρίνομαι and λέγω elsewhere, this happens sometimes in the MSS: Brock, *Recensions*, 207, refers to 1 Sam 25:10 where A alone changes ἀπεκρίθη to εἶπεν. An example of a change in the contrary direction is found in MS 125 in 24:17.

⁷² My analysis of this variation unit is published as T. Kauhanen, “Traces of the Proto-Lucianic Text”, BIOSCS 40 (2007): 75–87.

Cf. 12:3 רְצוּתִי אֶת־מִי עֲשֵׂקָתִי וְאֶת־מִי הִי תִינָא κατεδυνάστευσα ὑμῶν ἢ τῖνα ἐξέπρῃσα

οὐκ ἡδίκησας ἡμᾶς καί] > *L* Iren 4,26,4 Chr *Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1* 9
καὶ οὐκ ἔθλασας] pr οὐδὲ ἐκπεπίακας *CI* 29; pr ἡμᾶς οὐδὲ ἐκπεπίακας *Ald*;
pr οὐδὲ εκπεποιακας ἡμῖν 488; ἡμᾶς οὐδὲ ἐκπεπίακας *L*
Chr Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1 9⁷³ Iren 4,26,4 (*Lat.: neque oppressisti nos*); > *A O d*
(⁻¹²⁵) 554 = *MT*⁷⁴

neminem nocuisti per potentiam, nec pressisti nos Spec.

non es calumniatus nos, neque oppressisti Gildans Sapiens, De excidio et conquestu Britanniae

nemini nostrum nocuisti, nec per potentiam aliquem oppressisti, nec confregisti
nos Ferrandus, Epist. 7,6

There is great confusion in the witnesses about the number and sequence of the people's assurances of the things that Samuel has not done to them. In the following only the presence or absence of the expressions is noted, not any of the minor differences.

B M V *CII a b f s* 55 A O *d*^(-125 h.t.) 554 *L* (Iren 4,26,4) *CI* 488 29
71 158 244 = MT?

οὐκ ἠδίκησας	οὐκ ἠδίκησας	οὐκ ἠδίκησας
ἡμᾶς	ἡμᾶς	ἡμᾶς
καὶ οὐ	καὶ οὐ	οὐ
κατεδυνάστευσας	κατεδυνάστευσας	κατεδυνάστευσας
καὶ οὐκ ἔθλασας	ἡμᾶς οὐδὲ	οὐδὲ
ἡμᾶς	ἡμᾶς	ἐκπεπίακας καὶ
		οὐκ ἔθλασας ἡμᾶς

⁷³ The answer of the people in Chrysostom's sermon actually reads: οὐτὲ κατεδυνάστευσας ἡμᾶς, οὐτὲ ἐξεπίεσας.

⁷⁴ Minor variant readings: ἡμᾶς 1^o] υμᾶς 242 488; > 44-107-125-610 | om καί 2^o – καί 4^o 125 | καὶ οὐ] ου O 460; ουδε 44-107-610 | οὐ κατεδυνάστευσας] ουκ ἐδυναστευσας 460 707 | κατεδυναστευκας CI 246 29 55* 71; καταδεδυναστευκας 56 318 | καί 3^o – καί 4^o] ημᾶς Compl.

In verse 12:3, B and the majority have two Greek verbs for the two Hebrew verbs קָשַׁע ‘to oppress, wrong’ and רָצַר ‘to smash up, crush’, whereas in 12:4 there are three verbs. Both ἀδικέω ‘to do wrong’ and καταδυναστεύω ‘to oppress’ seem to render the Hebrew root קָשַׁע while θλάω ‘to crush, bruise’ clearly reflects the Hebrew רָצַר – it is the most frequent rendering for this verb. Ferrandus no doubt follows this reading. The Hexaplaric witnesses (A O d⁻¹²⁵ 554) have only two items, thus being in quantitative conformity with the MT. Probably the last item in the B-text, καὶ οὐκ ἔθλασας, was marked with an obelos in the Hexapla and subsequently omitted in the Hexaplaric manuscript tradition. The L-reading does not attest the verb ἀδικέω. Rather, it repeats the equivalents found in the previous verse, καταδυναστεύω ‘to oppress’ and ἐκπιέζω ‘to force out’. A small group of witnesses (CI 488 29) clearly combine the readings of the majority and L.

There are three possible explanations for these differences. If the B-text represents the OG, either (1) the translator produced a double rendering of קָשַׁע from which the Lucianic reviser left the other half out or (2) the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translator was longer. (3) The original translation contained only two elements. Facing the words וְקָשַׁע אֱלֹהִים in verse 12:4, the translator probably translated them as οὐ κατεδυνάστευσας ἡμᾶς, using the same equivalent as in the previous verse. The reading οὐκ ἠδίκησας ἡμᾶς of B and the majority could actually be seen as a pre-Hexaplaric Hebraizing correction: the correctors considered the standard, concordant rendering for קָשַׁע to be ἀδικέω as in Leviticus and Deuteronomy,⁷⁵ and added this to the beginning of the clause while retaining the original translation. The translator rendered רָצַר either with θλάω as in B and the majority, or ἐκπιέζω as in L and the previous verse. Of the Latin witnesses Iren *Lat.* and *Spec.* (and possibly Gildans Sapiens) reflect the form found in L.

The Witnesses Reflecting the Hypothetical Old Greek in 1 Sam 12:4

MT	L	<i>Spec.</i> 143	Iren <i>Lat.</i> 4,26,4
אֱלֹהִים	οὐ	<i>neminem nocuisti</i>	<i>neque</i>
וְקָשַׁע	κατεδυνάστευσας ἡμᾶς	<i>per potentiam,</i>	<i>potentatus es,</i>
אֱלֹהִים	οὐδὲ	<i>nec</i>	<i>neque</i>
וְרָצַר	ἐκπεπίακας ἡμᾶς	<i>pressisti nos</i>	<i>oppressisti</i> (Rousseau : = ἐξέπιασας) <i>nos</i>

The *potens*-element in the readings *neminem nocuisti per potentiam* and *neque potentatus es* strongly suggests that they are renderings of

⁷⁵ In all seven occurrences in Leviticus and Deuteronomy of the root קָשַׁע – whether as a verb or a noun – the rendering is ἀδικέω, ἀπαδικέω, or ἀδίκημα.

καταδυναστεύω.⁷⁶ The verbs *premo* and *opprimo* are used as renderings of ἐκπιέζω in verse 12:3. According to Lundström, there would be variation in the Latin translation of Irenaeus if there were variation of nearly synonymous words in the Greek text.⁷⁷ Therefore we may quite safely conclude that the verb ἐκπιέζω was twice in Irenaeus' Greek text.⁷⁸ Is it also the original reading? It is true that the translator of 1 Samuel varies the equivalents he uses⁷⁹ and in that respect there would be no problem in accepting the reading ἔθλασας of the majority. The Lucianic reviser could well have harmonized the usage in verses 3 and 4 by changing θλάω to ἐκπιέζω. On the other hand, ἔθλασας is actually exactly the reading that a Hebraizing corrector would have produced. Moreover, ἐκπιέζω corresponds a little less exactly to the Hebrew and is a somewhat more expressive word. Renderings of that kind may be expected from the translator of 1 Samuel. If this is correct, Irenaeus and *L* agree in preserving the original reading in its entirety.

12:4 מְרִיבֵי שְׂאֵלֵי דְמַרְיָא וְשִׁיבֵי דְמַרְיָא וְשִׁיבֵי דְמַרְיָא καὶ οὐκ εἴληφας ἐκ χειρὸς οὐδενὸς οὐδέν

οὐδενὸς οὐδέν] τινὸς οὐδέν *O* 158 ≈ MT; οὐδέν 107-610; ὑμῶν (ἡμῶν Compl) οὐδέν 19' 125; οὐδενὸς ἡμῶν οὐδέν *L*^{-19'}; *cuiusquam aliquid* Iren 4,26,4

Contrary to what Voogd implies,⁸⁰ the reading of Irenaeus hardly represents *L* – or, rather, 19' – here. Translating the Greek double negative is a well-known problem in Latin:⁸¹ οὐκ εἴληφας ἐκ χειρὸς οὐδενός can be rendered, e.g., as *non accepisti de manu cuiusquam* or *accepisti de manu nullius*,⁸² but not with two negations. Irenaeus' Latin text might also reflect a Greek expression without the double negative, as found in *O* 158 (οὐκ εἴληφας ἐκ χειρὸς τινός).

⁷⁶ Cf. also *potentatum exerceo* in Iren *Lat.* 4,36,2 for καταδυναστεύω in Zech 7:10 (πένητα μὴ καταδυναστεύετε). Lundström, *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen*, 225 mentions that *potentari* is found as an equivalent for καταδυναστεύω in other translations.

⁷⁷ Lundström, *Studien*, 84.

⁷⁸ This is in accordance with the reconstruction in SC. Reynders' index to Irenaeus gives for *opprimo* only such Greek equivalents as are based on passages quoted from the LXX. Therefore both ἐκπιέζω and θλάω are given as equivalents for *opprimo* in this passage, as well as καταδυναστεύω in *Haer.* 3,12,7 quoting Acts 10:38 and 4,17,3 quoting Zech 7:10. CSCO 142, 222.

⁷⁹ See above n. 69.

⁸⁰ Voogd, *Old Latin Texts*, 23.

⁸¹ Fischer, "Limitations", 365.

⁸² Neither of the expressions as such is found in Latin texts. Both constructions, however, are well attested in, e.g., Cicero's texts (one example of each will suffice): *ille non eguit consilio cuiusquam* (*Orationes philippicae* 19), *nullius adhuc consilium me huic antepone* (*Epistulae ad familiares* 18,2).

12:5⁸³ וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וַיָּבֵינָהּ מָרְטוּס χριστὸς αὐτοῦ σήμερον ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

σήμερον ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ Cyril, *Comm. Jo.* 1,716] ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ 489; ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ 509⁸⁴; σήμερον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ CI⁻³⁷⁹ f 55 245 318; ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ L 29 707; > 379; in die hac Iren Lat. 4,26,4 Greg Reg. 5,27 = Vg.; *odierna die Antiphonale Mozarabicum* 183^v; in *hodierna die Spec.* 143

The variation concerns 1. the presence of the word σήμερον and 2. the word order in the expression “on this day”, but is best treated as one variation unit. The classical form of the expression “on this day” is ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.⁸⁵ The pleonastic σήμερον + the prepositional phrase is found only in 1 Sam 12:5 and 17:10, in Cyril’s quotation of 12:5, and in Theodoret’s *Quaest.* 585 quoting 1 Sam 25:32 (Theodoret’s reading is against all LXX MSS). The Hebrew expression הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה is almost exclusively rendered by ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ (or the words in whatever case) in the Octateuch and 2 Samuel – 2 Kings (no difference between the καίγε and non-καίγε sections of these books). The usage of the rendering σήμερον for הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה is limited to 1 Samuel (14:45, 17:46a [at the end of vs. 45 in the LXX], 24:20, 30:25), with the exception of Jer 1:10.⁸⁶

It could be argued that the pleonastic expression must be original in these cases since the variation could be seen as resulting from a desire to make the expression less bizarre. However, it seems more probable that the same Hebraizing correction as in the doublet in 12:4 is at work here. I present two scenarios testing two different solutions:

1. The original reading is the simple σήμερον. This is in accordance with the usage of the translator elsewhere in 1 Samuel (see above). The phrase ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ was added to correspond to the Hebrew expression הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה – this is the text form attested by CI⁻³⁷⁹ f 55 245 318. In the text form reflected by the majority of the witnesses the word order was changed to ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. The motivation behind this could have been to bring the equivalent for הַיּוֹם right after the equivalent for הַיּוֹם – it is difficult to explain why τῇ ἡμέρᾳ was not omitted at the same time. In L 29 707 (and 509) the redundant σήμερον was omitted.

However, this scenario contains the following problems: a. The original reading is not found in any witness. b. Doublets are usually added before, not after, the original translation. c. While secondary omission of σήμερον could fit the polishing tendency of L, MSS 29 and 707 are not dependent on L. How should their reading be explained?

⁸³ MSS d⁻¹⁰⁶ 71 omit the whole verse due to a homoioarcton.

⁸⁴ This is the form that Rousseau reconstructs as Irenaeus’ Greek text.

⁸⁵ E.g., Demosthenes, *In Neaeram* 116; Xenophon, *Hellenica* 1,4,12; Aristotle, *Constitution of Athens* 43,4; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.240.

⁸⁶ The rendering σήμερον ἐν ταύτῃ is found in the LXX only in 1 Sam 25:32, 33, and 26:24. The expression is not found outside the LXX. An interesting rendering is ἐν ταύτῃ without σήμερον in Josh 22:22.

2. The original reading is ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ. This is the rendering used in 2 Samuel. It has been retained by four independent witnesses: *L*, 29, 707, and Irenaeus (on whose reading see below). The word σήμερον was added before this expression in conformation with הַיּוֹם.⁸⁷ This could be motivated by the lack of a preposition in the Hebrew: ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ could suggest the presence of the preposition -בִּ in the Hebrew text. For a corrector who was interested in all the details of the text this could have been an important factor. The resulting text form is the one found in *CI*⁻³⁷⁹ f 55 245 318. In the text form attested by the majority, the word order was changed for the same reason as in the previous scenario. The text form in MS 509 derives from that reading, but in it the redundant σήμερον was dropped – no doubt at a late stage of the textual transmission.⁸⁸

This scenario is far less problematic than the previous one. The only disturbing detail is the non-Semitic word order in the majority text.

The word order ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ (*L CI*⁻³⁷⁹ f 29 55 245 318 707) is found exclusively in Christian Greek, and because it reflects the Hebrew word order, it is probably a Semitism. Likewise, the expression *in die hac/hoc*⁸⁹ / *in hac/hoc die* is attested only in Christian Latin, and even in it the expression *hodie in die hac* (or the words in whatever order) is non-existent. The expression in *Speculum*, *in hodierna die*, is found a few times elsewhere in Christian Latin (e.g., Lucifer, *Parc.* chapters 13 and 14). These observations make it dubious whether the Latin translator would have rendered both σήμερον and ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ even if Irenaeus had quoted the words of the B-text. The same may hold true for the Armenian translation, which also lacks a correspondence to σήμερον. Accordingly, Irenaeus very likely attests the minus of σήμερον, but that does not necessarily have to originate with his copy of the LXX.

However, Irenaeus seems to attest the word order of *L*: ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ / *in die hac*. In Latin the word order *in hac/hoc die* is the more usual one: it is attested 227 times in Latin texts and twice by Irenaeus' translator himself (*Haer.* 3,14,3; 4,8,2: these are not biblical quotations). The order *in die hac/hoc* is attested only 40 times in Latin texts and 28 of them are from the Vulgate or from a biblical quotation. Irenaeus' translator has this expression only here in 4,26,4. Therefore it seems plausible that if Irenaeus' translator had had the words ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (B and majority) in the Greek exemplar⁹⁰, he would have resorted to his previously used expression *in hac die*. In any text, great caution must be exercised when arguing anything of the Greek word order on

⁸⁷ According to Reider-Turner, in Aquila σήμερον is the standard equivalent for הַיּוֹם: Exod 16:25, 32:29 sub οἱ γ'; 34:11 sub α' σ' θ'; Deut 11:8, 1 Kgs 21[20]:13, Ps 2:7, Hos 4:5 sine nomine; Jer 41[34]:15 (syr), 49[42]:19 sub ast.

⁸⁸ In all likelihood, the same thing has happened in 17:10 where the secondary σήμερον is attested by A B O b d 554 707 and L C' a f s 29 55 71 158 245 318 460 retain the original reading.

⁸⁹ The word *dies* is masculine in the plural and sometimes treated as such in the singular also.

⁹⁰ As suggested by the reconstruction of SC. No comment is given by Rousseau in his "notes justificatives" (SC 100:1).

the basis of the word order in a Latin translation,⁹¹ but it seems that Irenaeus and *L* do indeed agree in the original reading.

12:5 ܡܪܝܬܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܢ ܡܪܬܝܢ καὶ εἶπαν Μάρτυς

εἶπαν] εἶπεν ὁ λαός *L* 554; *dixerunt ei* Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4; + *omnes* Sa

The *L*-reading is most probably a recensional explication of the subject⁹² – the number of the predicate is changed accordingly. The addition of the object *ei* is best seen as a free explication in Iren *Lat.*: it is lacking in the Armenian translation (and Rousseau reconstructs the Greek text accordingly).

4.3 Conclusion

The Latin translator of *Against Heresies* reproduces his Greek original quite accurately and Irenaeus himself is often precise in his quotations. Iren *Lat.* and *L* agree five times in preserving the original reading against all or most of the other witnesses:⁹³

12:3 ἀποκρίθητε 2^o] εἰπατε *L* 554 Chr Tht Iren 4,26,4 (*Lat.*: *dicite*) Pesh (ܐܝܬܝܢ)

12:4 οὐκ ἠδίκησας ἡμᾶς καί] > *L* Iren 4,26,4 (*L* and Iren agree in having one element less than B)

12:4 καὶ οὐκ ἔθλασας] pr ουδε εκπεπιακας *CI* 29; ημας ουδε εκπεπιακας *L* Iren 4,26,4 (*Lat.*: *neque oppressisti nos*); > *A O d* 554 = MT

12:5 σήμερον ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ] σήμερον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ *CI* ⁻³⁷⁹ *f* 55 245 318; ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ *L* 29 707 Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4 (*in die hac* = Greg Vg.); > 379

15:22 εἰ θελητὸν τῷ κυρίῳ ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ θυσίαι] ἰδοὺ οὐ θέλει κς ὀλοκαυτώσεις καὶ θυσίας *L* 554^{mg} Tht; *non vult deus holocausta et sacrificia* Iren *Lat.* 4,17,1

Irenaeus agrees with the B-text against *L* in five variation units. In these, the reading of *L* is without support from non-Lucianic witnesses and almost certainly secondary:

⁹¹ Fischer, “Limitations”, 369.

⁹² This fits well with Brock’s observations of tendencies in *L* that suggest that the text was designed for public reading. Brock, *Recensions*, 252.

⁹³ The apparatuses below are shortened.

12:3 ἐξεπίεσα Iren 4,26,4] + υμων L Chr Tht

12:3 τίνος 3^ο Iren 4,26,4] + υμων L 554 Chr Tht

12:3 ὑπόδημα Iren 4,26,4 *Spec.* 143 Ferrandus, *Epist.* 7,6] pr παροψομαι
οφθαλμούς εν αυτω η 731^{mg} s^{-64'} 119^c; + και απεκρυψα τους οφθαλμούς
μου (> 554) εν αυτω L^{-19'} 554 Chr Tht

12:4 οὐδενός Iren 4,26,4] υμων 19' 125; ημων Compl; > 107-610; + ημων
L^{-19'} (but Irenaeus has his own pattern for personal pronouns in the passage
in question)

15:22 ἰδού Iren 4,17,1] + γαρ L Tht

Despite his general faithfulness to his Greek original, the Latin translator of *Against Heresies* makes small adaptations according to the needs of the context or the usage of the Latin language. There are five special readings of Iren *Lat.*:

12:2 ἐκ νεότητός μου] *a primo aetate mea* Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4

12:2 καὶ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης] *usque nunc* Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4

12:3 χειρὸς τίνος] *alicujus manu* Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4 (transposition)

12:5 εἶπαν] ειπεν ο λαος L 554; *dixerunt ei* Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4; + *omnes* Sa

15:22 ὥς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι Iren *Arm.* 4,17,1 ([*magis*] *quam exaudiri*)] *sed vult exaudiri* Iren *Lat.* 4,17,1

Differences between the Latin and Armenian translations prevent establishing Irenaeus' Greek reading with sufficient certainty in the following five instances (readings *mihi* and *dei* in Iren *Lat.* in 12:3 may be special readings):

12:2 διελήλυθα] pr δη 92; εληλυθα 121 44 92; ανεστραμμαι L 554^{mg} Chr;
conversatus sum Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4 *Spec.* 143 (Iren *Arm.* may have a doublet
attesting both readings)

12:3 κατ' ἐμοῦ 1^ο Iren *Arm.* 4,26,4 (*adversus me*)] *mihi* Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4

12:3 κυρίου Iren *Arm.* 4,26,4] *dei* Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4

12:3 μόσχον τίνος (pr ει et tr 125) Iren *Arm.* 4,26,4 (<*vitulum*> *si cuius*)]
μοσχον τινος υμων L 55 Sa Chr Tht; *cujus vestrum vitulum* Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4

15:22 κυρίου Iren *Arm.* 4,17,1] αυτου L Tht Iren *Lat.* 4,17,1 (*suam*) *Spec.* 29

The situation is somewhat similar in the following cases, in which Irenaeus might attest one or the other of the Greek readings, but certainty of his exact reading is lost because of the differences between the Greek and Latin usages. This makes three instances of supposed agreement between Iren *Lat.* and *L* only apparent:

12:3 κατεδυνάστευσα ὑμῶν] > ὑμῶν A O 44-125 f 245 707 = MT; ὑμῶν καταδεδυναστευκα *L* Chr Tht; *super quem potentatus sum* Iren *Lat.* 4,26,4

15:22 ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθή 247 C' f 64' 130-314-489 29 55 71 554] ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθήν A B V 376 a b d 92-488 158 244 245 318 460 707; ἀγαθη υπερ θυσιαν *L* Tht Iren *Lat.* 4,17,1 (*bonus super sacrificium*)

15:22 ἡ ἐπακρόασις Iren *Arm. Gr.* 4,17,1] ἀκρόασις O *L* Tht; *auditus* Iren *Lat.* 4,17,1; *obaudientia* La^M; *oboedientia* Luc *Reg.* 2; *audientia mandatorum* *Spec.* 29

In the light of these analyses, it is easy to vindicate Brock's conclusions that the agreement between Irenaeus and *L* is most often agreement in the original reading and when Irenaeus goes against *L* the latter gives obviously secondary readings. It has also become clear that Voogd greatly overemphasized the Lucianic nature of Irenaeus' quotations: we have encountered five actual agreements between Irenaeus and *L* against B and four or five agreements with B against *L*, while according to Voogd the proportion should be "about three to one."⁹⁴

⁹⁴ Voogd, "Old Latin Texts", 25.

5 Tertullian

5.1 Prolegomena

Tertullian (Tert), a priest in Carthage, wrote actively between 195 and 220 CE. There are two especially important questions relating to the use of his Bible quotations as a textual witness: 1. Tertullian's citation method is often paraphrastic, and therefore the citations that may safely be accepted are quite few.¹ 2. Whether Tertullian made use of Old Latin Bible translations or translated the text himself from Greek (or did both) is a disputed question. Adolf von Harnack concluded that Tertullian used Marcion's Bible in Latin and never translated himself.² Hans von Soden³ and A.J.B. Higgins⁴, on the other hand, maintained that Tertullian quoted both some Old Latin Bible and a Latin version of Marcion's Bible. The editor of Tertullian's *Against Marcion* in the SC series, Claudio Moreschini, considers it impossible to judge whether Tertullian translated himself or used Old Latin versions.⁵ More recently, a strong case has been made by Ulrich Schmid and Dieter T. Roth for a Greek original that Tertullian himself reproduced in Latin.⁶ A strong indication in this direction is Tertullian's quotation from 1 Sam 14:24, where he apparently has misread the word ἄρτου as αὐτοῦ and translated it as *eius*. The considerations concerning Marcion's Bible are, of course, valid only for the NT; in the OT the situation may be significantly different. Kannengiesser diplomatically proposes that Tertullian *both* made use of Old Latin Bible translations *and* translated himself from the Greek texts.⁷

Concerning the Books of Kings, Rahlfs concluded that Tertullian's Septuagint text does not have a close relationship with the Lucianic text.⁸ For 1 Sa-

¹ This is universally recognized, see, e.g., Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 28; Brock, *Revisions*, 196.

² A. von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (2d ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985 [1st ed. 1921]), 48*–9*. Tertullian's Bible text is discussed in "Beilage III", 43*–56*.

³ H. von Soden, "Der lateinische Paulustext bei Marcion und Tertullian", in *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag 26. Januar 1927* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1927), 229–81, 239.

⁴ A.J.B. Higgins, "The Latin Text of Luke in Marcion and Tertullian", *VC* 5,1 (1951): 1.

⁵ C. Moreschini/R. Braun (ed.), *Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome IV (livre IV)* (SC 456; Paris: Cerf, 2001), 34.

⁶ U. Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe* (ANTF 25; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995); D.T. Roth, "Did Tertullian Possess a Greek Copy or Latin Translation of Marcion's Gospel?", *VC* 63,5 (2009): 429–67. Roth's article contains an informative research history (pp. 429–42).

⁷ Kannengiesser, *Handbook*, 593.

⁸ Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 141: "Tertullians Septuaginta-Text zeigt also keine intimen Beziehungen zu L." (Emphasis his.)

muel Brock gives a more cautious evaluation: “on the slim evidence Tertullian appears to be a partial witness to *L*[.]”⁹ Voogd is perhaps a bit more optimistic in stating that “the majority of the readings [of Tertullian] are in accord with Luc.”¹⁰ The analysis below for the most part vindicates Voogd’s and Brock’s conclusions, but on the basis of readings other than those presented by Voogd (see conclusion).

Readings that have been considered proto-Lucianic in scholarship are found in three works: *Against Marcion* (*Marc.*, book 2 written between 208 and 209 CE, edited in SC 368, and book 4, 210–213 CE, SC 456); *De fuga in persecutione* (*Fug.*, 208–209 CE, CCL 2); and *De jejunio adversus psychicos* (*Jejun.*, 210–211, CCL 2).

In order to test the hypothesis of whether Old Latin influence could be seen in Tertullian’s quotations from 1 Samuel, special attention is paid to this possibility in the analysis.

5.2 Analysis

5.2.1 *De Jejuno* 9,7 = 1 Sam 1:11

Rahlfs = Ant	Tert <i>Jejun.</i> 9,7	Old Latin
11b καὶ δώσω αὐτὸν ἐνώπιόν σου δοτὸν ἕως ἡμέρας θανάτου αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα οὐ πίεται ...	Habet enim et abstinentia uini suos titulos, quae et Samuelem deo uouerat et Aaronem consecrarat. Nam de Samuele mater: “ <i>et uinum</i> ,” inquit, “ <i>et ebriamen non bibet</i> ”; talis enim et ipsa deum orabat.	<i>et vinum et siceram non bibet</i> La ^M
Cf. Lev 10:8–9 καὶ ἐλάλησεν κύριος τῷ Ααρων λέγων οἶνον καὶ σικερα οὐ πίεσθε Cf. Luke 1:15 καὶ οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ μὴ πίη	Et dominus ad Aaron: “ <i>uinum et siceram non bibetis</i> ”	<i>uinum et siceram non bibit</i> Hier <i>Epist.</i> 107,3,3

1:11 – καὶ οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα οὐ πίεται

4QSam^a: [ויין ושכר לוא ישתה]

μέθυσμα Chr *Anna* 2,2 Phil *Ebr* 143] σίκερα 82 La^M Sa Bas *Jejun.* 2,6
Chr *Eclog.* 583 Jerome, *Epist.* 107,3,3; *ebriamen* Tert *Jejun.* 9,7

⁹ Brock, *Recensions*, 197.

¹⁰ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 28.

The clause “and wine and strong drink he shall not drink” (NETS) is lacking in the MT. It is, however, attested by all the LXX MSS (omitted only by Origen, *Orat.* 4,1 and Compl).¹¹ Moreover, according to the editors, considerations of space require reconstructing the clause in 4QSam^a.¹² Thus MS 82 might have a Hebrew referent ([ושכר] 4QSam^a) on the basis of which the copyist could have made a Hebraizing alteration σίκερα towards שכר from which the Greek word is derived. This is not, however, necessary; in the Octateuch and Isaiah, the Hebrew word is rendered by σίκερα (Lev 10:9; Num 6:3, 28:7; Deut 14:26, 29:5; Judg (A) 13:4, 7, 14; Isa 5:11, 22, 24:9, 28:7, 29:9), μέθυσμα appearing only in the B-text of Judges (13:4, 7, 14). The rendering μέθυσμα, however, appears in 1 Sam 1:11, 15; Jer 13:13; Hos 4:11; and Mic 2:11.¹³ The reading of MS 82 and La^M most likely comes from one of the most obvious parallel passages (Lev 10:9, Judg 13:4, or Luke 1:15). Tertullian, however, reflects the reading μέθυσμα by *ebriamen*.

5.2.2 Against Marcion 4,14,5–6 = 1 Sam 2:8

This passage¹⁴ contains two short quotations from the Song of Hannah (1 Sam 2:1–10) and they follow each other immediately in Tertullian’s treatise. Both are given here with the parallel Greek texts.¹⁵

1 Sam 2:8α (Rahlfs = Ant)	Tert <i>Marc.</i> 4,14,5	Tert <i>Marc.</i> 4,14,6	Cf. Tert <i>Marc.</i> 4,34,17
ἀνιστᾷ ἀπὸ γῆς πένητα καὶ ἀπὸ κοπρίας ἐγείρει πτωχόν	Item: (Ps 112[113]:5–7) <i>quis sicut deus noster, qui habitat in excelsis et humilia prospectat in caelo et in terra, qui suscitatur mendicum de terra et de stercore exaltat pauperem ...</i>	Sic et retro in Basilis Anna, mater Samuhelis, spiritu gloriam deo redens: <i>qui, inquit, excitatur pauperem de terra et¹⁶ mendicum</i>	...deus qui de thronis deponit dynastas, et de sterculinis eleuat inopes

¹¹ P. Walters, *The Text of the Septuagint* (ed. D. W. Gooding; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 344: “Vercellone approves of an earlier suggestion that it [= the sentence] may have been taken from Judg. 13:24 or Luke 1:15.”

¹² F.M. Cross/D.W. Parry/R.J. Saley/E.C. Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel* (DJD XVII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), 29–30.

¹³ There are also the renderings οἶνος and μέθη, each 2 times; Tov-Polak.

¹⁴ SC 14,5–6 corresponds to CCL 1 14,6.

¹⁵ The table giving the texts is divided into two parts, the latter below.

¹⁶ In CCL 1 the editors provide here as a plus the emendation suggested by August Engelbrecht in angle brackets: <de stercore eleuat>.

2:8 לְהַרְגֵּם מִקִּימֵי מַעְפָּר דְּלֵי אֲנִיסְטָא אֶפְסֵי גִיָּה פֶּנְהֵטָא

ἀπὸ γῆς / πένητα] tr Tert Marc. 4,14,5.6

πένητα et πτωχόν Tert Marc. 4,14,5] tr 731^{mg} 106-120-134
Tert Marc. 4,14,6

ἐγείρει] ἀνιστᾷ 731^{mg} 120-134; ἀνυψῶν 106; *exaltat* Tert Marc. 4,14,5;
eleuat Tert Marc. 4,14,6; 4,34,17

Cf. Ps 113(112):7 אֲנִיסְטָא דְּלֵי מַאֲשַׁפֶּת יְרִים אֶפְסֵי מִקִּימֵי מַעְפָּר דְּלֵי גִיָּה פֶּנְהֵטָא
καὶ ἀπὸ κοπρίας ἀνυψῶν πένητα

Tertullian's quotations agree among themselves in the word order *mendicum/ pauperem de terra* against the LXX, but have a different word for “raising” and “lifting” (NETS) and give the “poor” and the “needy” in different order. Since the Latin *mendicum* very likely corresponds to the Greek πένητα and *pauperem* to πτωχόν, the former quotation (14,5) corresponds better to the Greek text of 1 Samuel. However, the latter (14,6) is the one explicitly introduced as the words of Hannah but its word order is that of Psalm 113(112). The short quotation in Marc. 4,34,17 changes *stercus* ‘dung’ to *sterculinium* ‘dung-pit’ and brings up another word for ‘poor’ or ‘needy’: *inops*. All in all, while these must certainly be classified as *adaptations* (rather than *allusions*; see p. 20), they seem to be inexact.

A comparison with other Latin readings is in order:¹⁷

suscitat mendicum de terra et de stercore exaltat pauperem Tert Marc. 4,14,5

excitat pauperem de terra et mendicum Tert Marc. 4,14,6

de sterculinis eleuat inopes Tert Marc. 4,34,17

resuscitat a terra pauperē et de stercore leuat mediocrem La¹¹⁵

elevat a terra pauperem et de stercore exaltat inopem La²⁵⁰

suscitat a terra pauperem, et de stercore erigit inopem Ambrose,
Exh. virginit. 16 Aug Civ. 17,4 Euch Comm. Reg. 50:1051a

*Suscitat (-tans 400ff) a terra pauperem: & de stercore suscitāt (-tans 400ff)
inopem* La³⁰⁰ La^{400ff}

erigit a terra pauperem et ab sterquilino erigit inopem PsCyp Novat. 13,1

Suscitat a terra inopem: et ab stercore erigit pauperem La⁴¹⁰ 18

eleuat de terra inopem et de stercore erigit pauperem Ruf Greg. Orat. 1,117,1

Suscitans de pulvere egenum, et de stercore elevans pauperem La³⁰⁹ ≈ Vg.

¹⁷ La²⁵⁰ La³⁰⁰ La³⁰⁹ La^{400ff} La⁴¹⁰ are Odes MSS; 1 Sam 2:1–10 = Ode 3.

¹⁸ The following have a very similar text to that of La⁴¹⁰ with only minor variants: Ambrose, *Paen.* 1,23, *Ob. Theo.* 42, *Virg.* 1,3; *Brev. Goth.* 86:130c.

Tertullian's independence of the Latin traditions is evident from several phenomena limited only to Tertullian (in bold above): 1. the use of the word *mendicus* 'beggary, needy'; 2. the word order "raises" + object + "from the earth"; 3. "needy" right after "from the earth" (*Marc.* 4,14,6). Further, the following phenomena are found only in a couple of other Old Latin witnesses apart from Tertullian (underlined above): 4. the preposition *de* in connection with *terra*; 5. *exalto* and *elevo* as the second verb; 6. the word *sterquilinium* (*stercul-*) 'dung-pit'.

1 Sam 2:8aβ (Rahlfs)	Tert <i>Marc.</i> 4,14,5	Tert <i>Marc.</i> 4,14,6	1 Sam 2:8aβ (Ant)
-------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------

καθίσαι μετὰ δυναστῶν λαῶν καὶ θρόνον δόξης κατακληρονομῶν αὐτοῖς.	<i>uti sedere eum faciat cum principibus populi</i>	<i>uti sedere eum faciat cum dynastis populi et in thronis glorie</i>	τοῦ καθίσαι αὐτὸν μετὰ δυναστῶν λαοῦ, καὶ θρόνον δόξης κατακληρονομῶν αὐτοῖς.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2:8 עֲשֵׂה לְיָהוָה יֹשִׁיב עִם-נְדִיבִים καθίσαι μετὰ δυναστῶν λαῶν

καθίσαι A B M *CI* ^{-(243).731mg} 527 b 68' 56 29 55 158] pr τοῦ V O L
CII-731^{mg} a ⁻⁵²⁷ d ^{-68'} 246 s 71 244 318 460 554 707 Tht *Ep. Pauli* 37 = Ald:
cf. MT; *uti sedere eum faciat* Tert *Marc.* 4,14,5.6

The translator of 1 Samuel mostly renders the Hebrew infinitive construct with a Greek infinitive without the article.¹⁹ Since the meaning is final, the article works well in Greek, and, accordingly, it is most likely added in the majority of the MSS. The article does not, however, affect the meaning of the clause (transitive or intransitive, see below). Tertullian in his quotation prefixes the particle *uti* to make the final meaning fully explicit. That, however, does not need to reflect the Greek article.

¹⁹ Aejmelaeus, "1 Samuel", 135: "In the area of infinitives, he [= the translator] is equally skilful in using the infinitive mostly without the genitive article." Cf. the list of differences between the MSS in this respect in 1 Sam in I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (AASF B 132,1; Helsinki, 1965), 163. The present case, however, is regarded by Soisalon-Soininen as an omission of τοῦ in B etc. rather than an addition in the majority. According to the Tov-Polak alignment, the construction הָ + infinitive is found 228 times in 1 Samuel, out of which 123 (cf. Brock's "some 125" below) are rendered by a Greek infinitive, and only in 17 (= 14%) of these cases is τοῦ prefixed. The phenomenon is also noted by Brock, *Recensions*, 243: "As a final example the rendering of הָ + inf. is taken. Out of some 125 occurrences, apart from a few cases where the rendering is free, the Greek translates by infin. without τοῦ in all instances but the following ..." Brock counts altogether 14 instances plus one (15:21) in parentheses. He regards two further cases as "uncertain, but probably τοῦ should be regarded as secondary": 23:13, 15. The list is identical with that of the Tov-Polak alignment, with the exception that Brock omits 14:34 לְאֶחָד τοῦ ἐσθίειν and adds 15:21 (in parentheses).

2:8 καθίσαι B M 731^{mg} 527 b 68'-120-134 56 29 158 707 La¹¹⁵ PsCyp Ab. La³⁰⁹ Fulg Aet. 8 Greg Reg. 1,102 Nemnius Hist. 176 Euch Comm. Reg. 50:1051b] + αὐτόν A V O L C'-(243).731mg a⁻⁵²⁷ d^{-68'.120.134} 246 s 55 71 244 318 460 554 Aeth La^M La²⁵⁰ La³⁰⁰ La^{400ff} La⁴¹⁰ Tht Ep. Pauli 37 Aug Civ. 17,4 PsCyp Novat. 13,1 = Ald; *uti sedere eum faciat* Tert Marc. 4,14,5.6

Cf. Ps 47(46):9b–10aa יָשַׁב עַל־כִּסֵּא קִדְשׁוֹ נְדִיבֵי עַמִּים נִאֲסָפוּ ὁ θεὸς κάθηται ἐπὶ θρόνου ἁγίου αὐτοῦ. ἄρχοντες λαῶν συνήχθησαν ...

Cf. Ps 113(112):8 עָמוּ נְדִיבֵי עַם נְדִיבִים עִם־הַיְשִׁיבִי τοῦ καθίσαι αὐτόν μετὰ ἀρχόντων, μετὰ ἀρχόντων λαοῦ αὐτοῦ

The Hebrew verb corresponding to καθίσαι is in *hip'il* (הוֹשִׁיב) and is therefore causal: “in order to make [him/her/it] sit.” In Greek, however, the verb καθίζω can be either intransitive, or transitive with a causal meaning. Accordingly, without αὐτόν (B etc.) the sentence can be read either intransitively or transitively. 1. Intransitively: The subject (κύριος, v. 7) is the one who is to sit. This does not, however, fit well in the context: the purpose is to describe how God “raises up the poor,” and most likely the poor is the one who will be made to “sit with princes.” 2. Transitively: Since the verb καθίσαι may be seen as making a parallelism with the previous transitive verbs ἀνιστᾶ ... πένητα and ἐγείρει πτωχόν, even without αὐτόν it can be understood as transitive with the poor as the one who is to sit.²⁰

With αὐτόν, however, the expression can be read transitively as a verb-object construction (“to make him sit”). The translator may well have supplied αὐτόν to make the transitive meaning explicit.²¹ The pronoun may have dropped out since it is not needed for the correct understanding of the clause in Greek.²² Accordingly, καθίσαι αὐτόν (A V O L C'-(243).731mg a⁻⁵²⁷ d^{-68'.120.134} 246 s 55 71 244 318 460 554) is most likely the Old Greek reading.

The Latin evidence is best listed in full:

uti sedere eum faciat Tert Marc. 4,14,6 La²⁵⁰

et sedere facit La¹¹⁵ PsCyp Ab. 6

et sedere facit eum La^{400ff} La⁴¹⁰ Brev.Goth. 86:130c PsCyp Novat. 13,1 (tr. *eum facit* MS v)

et sedere eum facit Ambrose, Exh. virginit. 16

ut sedeat La³⁰⁹ Fulg Aet. 8 Greg Reg. 1,102 Nemnius, Hist. 176

et sedeat Euch Comm. Reg. 50:1051b

²⁰ Cf. NETS: while translating Rahlfs' text, “them” is added as an object: “to make them sit.”

²¹ In the Tov-Polak alignment, I counted 19 instances in 1 Samuel of a personal pronoun as an object in Rahlfs' text without a correspondence in the MT. A Greek infinitive is in question in 8:11, 12; 22:13 (diff. Vorlage?); and 23:25.

²² Because of the attestation of the omission, an early Hebraizing correction seems less probable, but might explain the omission in some textual traditions.

ut conlocet eum Aug Civ. 17,4
desedere facit eum La³⁰⁰

These readings can be classified according to whether they attest the intransitive or transitive meaning of ‘to sit’ and the absence or presence of the object αὐτόν.

A Tentative Grouping of the Latin Readings for καθίσαι (αὐτόν) (1 Sam 2:8)

καθίσαι (B etc.), *et sedeat* Euch Comm. Reg. 50:1051b
intransitive

ut sedeat La³⁰⁹ Fulg *Aet.* 8
Greg *Reg.* 1,102 Nemnius,
Hist. 176

καθίσαι (B etc.), *et sedere facit* La¹¹⁵ PsCyp *Ab.* 6
transitive

καθίσαι αὐτόν	<i>uti sedere eum faciat</i> Tert Marc. 4,14,6 La ²⁵⁰
(A V O L etc.),	<i>et sedere facit eum</i> La ^{400ff} La ⁴¹⁰ Brev. Goth. 86:130c PsCyp Novat.
transitive	13,1 Ambrose, <i>Exh. virginis</i> . 16 (tr. <i>eum facit</i>)
	<i>ut conlocet eum</i> Aug Civ. 17,4
	<i>desedere facit eum</i> La ³⁰⁰

The Latin verb *sedeo* is intransitive – therefore the readings *et/ut sedeat* mean “and would sit / in order to sit.”²³ The subject can be either Lord or the poor. The reading *et sedere facit* (La¹¹⁵ PsCyp *Ab.* 6) reflects the transitive meaning “to make sit,” but in all likelihood does not attest αὐτόν. The other readings with the object *eum*, on the other hand, most likely reflect the Greek reading with αὐτόν.²⁴ Accordingly, Tertullian agrees with *L* and the majority in attesting the original reading.

2:8 להוֹשִׁיב עַם-נְדִיבִים καθίσαι μετὰ δυναστῶν λαῶν

λαῶν A B b 68^c-122 56 Syh (÷)] λαοῦ L rel (68* vid) Sa Tht *Ep. Pauli* 37
= Ald; *populi* Tert *Marc.* 4,16,6 La^M La¹¹⁵ La²⁵⁰ La³⁰⁰ La⁴¹⁰ Aug *Civ.* 17,4
PsCyp *Novat.* 13,1 Euch *Comm. Reg.* 1; *plebis* La^{400ff.}; *λαου αυτου* Aeth
Syr^J; *populi sui* *Brev. Goth.* 86 PsCyp *Ab.* 6

Cf. Ps 47(46):9b–10a נָשַׁב עַל-בֶּסֶס יְשׁוּ נְדִיבֵי עַמִּים נִאֲרָפוּ ὁ θεὸς κάθηται ἐπὶ θρόνου ἁγίου αὐτοῦ. ἄρχοντες λαῶν συνήχθησαν ...

Cf. Ps 113(112):8 הוֹשִׁיבֵי עַם-נְדִיבִים עִם נְדִיבֵי עַמּוֹ τοῦ καθίσαι αὐτὸν μετὰ ἀρχόντων, μετὰ ἀρχόντων λαοῦ αὐτοῦ.

²³ Fischer, “Limitations”, 367, n. 2: “The best way of expressing the final infinitive is to render it with *ut*.”

²⁴ Those with the verb *sedeo* need the auxiliary verb *facio* to make the expression transitive – Augustine does not need *facio* since he uses the transitive verb *conloco*.

The LXX deviates from the MT²⁵ having a plus of either λαοῦ or λαῶν after “with princes.” McCarter²⁶ states that this results from contamination with the LXX of Psalms 47(46):10 and 113(112):8. This does not mean, however, that the word ‘people’ was added by the translator; it is equally probable that the word עַם²⁷ was present in the *Vorlage*, either in singular or plural. Was the Greek reading originally in singular or plural? The inner criteria are of little help in this instance: The change from plural to singular could have been made by a copyist who thought that *the* people – i.e., Israel – was meant²⁸ and, conversely, the change from singular to plural made by a copyist who was thinking more universally. Contamination with Psalms 113(112):8 or 47(46):10 could also have produced a change in either direction, and the same can be said of the transcriptional probability (ω ↔ ΟΥ in uncial script). Therefore in this instance it seems advisable to rely on the external evidence: the plural is attested only by four more or less independent MS traditions (A, B b, 68^c-122, and 56) and the Syrohexapla. The singular, by contrast, is attested in nearly all MS traditions and the Latin witnesses, including Tertullian.²⁹ This makes the singular a better choice for the original reading, and this explains Tertullian’s attestation to it.

5.2.3 *De Jejunio* 10,11 = 1 Sam 14:24–25

1 Sam 14:24– 25 (Rahlfs)	1 Sam 14:24–25 Ant	Tert <i>Jejun.</i> 10,11	La ¹¹⁵	La ^M	Jerome, <i>Jov.</i> 23:321b
		Certe Saul et ipse in proelio constitutus manifeste munus istud indixit:			
Ἐπικατάρα- τος ὁ ἄνθ- ρωπος, ὃς	Ἐπικατάρα- τος ὁ ἄνθ- ρωπος ὃς	<i>maledictus</i> <i>homo,</i> <i>qui</i>	<i>maledictus</i> <i>homo</i> <i>qui mandu-</i>	<i>Maledictus</i> <i>homo, qui</i> <i>manducave-</i>	<i>Maledictus</i> <i>qui</i> <i>ederit</i>

²⁵ The reconstruction of 4QSam^a in DJD XVII reads the same as the MT here and this is also the reading of the reconstruction of the original Song of Hannah (DJD XVII, 31–32, 37–38). No text-critical discussion is included in Cross’s treatment of this line.

²⁶ McCarter, *I Samuel*, 69. Brock, *Recensions*, 48: “λαῶν may be an interpolation.”

²⁷ According to Hatch-Redpath, there are sixteen other Hebrew words that correspond to λαός. In Octateuch-Kingdoms, however, there are extremely few cases in which λαός corresponds to some other word than עַם.

²⁸ Something similar can be seen in the reading δυναστῶν] δυνάστου 158, which gives the impression that the copyist had the single lord or ruler, the future king, in mind.

²⁹ The instance is accepted as an agreement between *L* and Tertullian by Brock, *Recensions*, 196.

φάγεται ἄρ- τον ἕως ἑσ- πέρας, καὶ ἐκδικήσω τὸν ἐχθρόν μου· καὶ οὐκ ἐγεύσατο πᾶς ὁ λαὸς (+ ο μετ' αὐτοῦ 55) ἄρτου. καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ἠρίστα.	φάγεται ἄρ- τον ἕως ἑσ- πέρας, καὶ ἐκδικήσω εἰς τὸν ἐχθρόν μου. καὶ οὐκ ἐγεύσατο πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἄρτου, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ἠρίστα.	<i>ederit pa- nem ad ues- peram us- que, dum ul- ciscar de inimico meo, et non gustauit totus populus eius, et tota terra prandebat.</i>	<i>caverit panē usque ad vesperam donec vindi- cem me de inimicum meum et non gustauit omnis populus panem et omnis terra prandebat [sic]</i>	<i>rit panem usque ad vesperum, donec ulcis- car inimicum meum; et non gustavit omnis populus panem, et omnis terra prandebat.</i>	<i>panem usque ad vesperam, donec ul- ciscar me de inimicis meis³⁰. Et non gustavit omnis populus ejus, et tota terra prandebat.</i>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

14:24 מַאֲבִי נִקְמָתִי עָלַי עַד כִּדְּמִי טֶנְעַם עֵלַי

Hexaplaric: ἐκδικήσω] τιμωρήσομαι 731 (s nom) 554 (s nom) 108 92 (σ')

τὸν ἐχθρόν μου (των εχθρων μου 318 460^c Sa^A; την εχθραν μου a⁻⁵²⁷)] pr
εἰς *L*; *de inimico meo* Tert *Jejun.* 10,11; (*donec vindicem me*) *de inimicum
meum* La¹¹⁵; (*donec ulciscar*) *inimicum meum* La^M; (*donec ulciscar* [+ *me*
Jerome]) *de inimicis meis* Vg. Jerome, *Jov.* 23:321b

Brock seems to accept the instance as an agreement between Tertullian and *L* in having a preposition before “my enemy.” Brock also suggests that “εἰς may be original.”³¹ A comparable instance is found in 1 Sam 18:25: לְהַנָּקָה בְּאֵבִי לְהַנָּקָה עָלַי (τοῦς *O*; om B 815 244) ἐχθροὺς τοῦ βασιλέως, where εἰς in all probability is the original reading and has fallen out simply by a mistake in B 815 244: while the verb ἐκδικέω is not construed with the preposition εἰς in classical Greek,³² the usage is found a couple of times elsewhere in the LXX.³³

The Latin verb *ulciscor* normally takes an accusative object, but it is found construed with *de* + abl.³⁴ in Christian Latin in the sense “to take vengeance on somebody for someone,” twice (apart from the present case) even by Tertullian himself.³⁵ In light of this, Tertullian’s attestation to a preposition in 1 Sam

³⁰ The reading *inimico meo* is given as a variant in PL.

³¹ Brock, *Recensions*, 196. The instance is included in Brock’s list “Tertullian = L(+) against LXX rell” but the *L*-reading is preceded by “cp” instead of an equals sign.

³² The earliest examples I found in the TLG are from the LXX.

³³ Ezek 25:12: הַנָּקָה בְּאֵבִי לְהַנָּקָה עָלַי ἐν τῷ ἐκδικήσαι αὐτοὺς ἐκδίκησιν εἰς τὸν οἶκον (ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ III Tht) Ιουδα; Sir 39:30: καὶ ῥομφαία ἐκδικοῦσα εἰς ὅλεθρον ἀσεβεῖς.

³⁴ The form with acc. *de inimicum meum* in La¹¹⁵ is a vulgar form; see the edition (Fischer et al., “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis”, loc. cit.) and Ulrich, “Characteristics and Limitations”, 287.

³⁵ I found the following instances: *ad ulciscendum de inimico* Iren *Haer.* 5,25,4; *ulciscar me de inimico meo* Cyp *Test.* 3,106, *Demetr.* 17; *non ulcisceris te de me* Luc *Parc.* 13, *quoniam usque non ulcisceris, domine, sanguinem nostrum de incolis terrae* Tert *Orat.* 5 quoting loosely Rev 6:10; and *quod etiam de*

14:24 probably has nothing more behind it than a rising trend of the Latin language. There is no real agreement between Tertullian and *L* in this reading.

5.2.4 *Against Marcion* 2,24,1 = 1 Sam 15:11

Rahlfs

Tert *Marc.* 2,24,1

Sic et paenitentiam apud illum praeinterpretaris, quasi proinde mobilitate uel improvidentia, immo iam ex delicti recordatione paeniteat, quoniam quidem dixerit:

Παρακέκλημαι (μεταμεμέλημαι Ant)
ὅτι ἐβασίλευσα (ἔχρισα maj)
τὸν Σαουλ εἰς βασιλέα

paenituit,
quod regem fecerim
Saul,
praescribens scilicet paenitentiam confessionem
sapere mali operis alicuius uel erroris.

15:11 תָּלַמְלִי לִי אֶשְׁתַּחֲוֶה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל παρακέκλημαι ὅτι ἐβασίλευσα τὸν Σαουλ εἰς βασιλέα

παρακέκλημαι A B O 93^{mg}-108^{mg} 121*(vid)] μεταμεμέλημαι L rel;
paenituit Tert *Marc.* 2,24,11; *paenitet me* La¹¹⁶ Vg.

Hexaplaric: θ' παρακεκλημαι σ' μετεμεληθην 243-731 (s nom)

Cf. 1 Sam 15:29 ἀποστρέψει οὐδὲ μετανοήσει] ψευσεται ουδε μεταμεληθησεται 243 (s nom) 731 (s nom) 108 (α') 92 (α')
μετανοῆσαι] θ' παρακληθηναι α' μεταμεληθηναι 243 731 (s nom)

Although Tertullian's formulation *paenituit* ("he has regretted," impersonally "I feel regret"³⁶) is rather free, the choice of verb (see the Old Latin evidence below) undoubtedly reflects the reading μεταμεμέλημαι of the majority and *L*. As Aejmelaeus argues, μεταμεμέλημαι is very likely the original reading.³⁷ μεταμέλομαι 'to regret, repent' is a good rendering for נִחַם *nip'al* 'to regret'. The Hebrew verb, however, means 'to comfort' in *pi'el* (and in *nip'al* it can mean 'to comfort oneself, to be comforted'), and in many forms the stems are indistinguishable in writing. Moreover, the idea of God "regretting" was ob-

ignorantibus dominum ulciscitur, id est de ethnicis Tert *Marc.* 5,16,2. This usage is attested also in the Vulgate (in addition to 1 Sam 14:24) in Num 31:2 (מֵאֵת הַמְּדִינִיִּים *de Madianitis*), Josh 10:13 (אֶיֶבֶי *de inimicis suis*), Judg 16:28 (*de hostibus meis*, the Hebrew correspondence is unclear), Jdt 13:27 (*de inimicis suis*; no Greek correspondence). The same preposition is used in 1 Sam 18:25, although instead of *ulciscor* a different formulation is used: בָּאֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ לְהַנָּקָם *ut fiat ultio de inimicis regis*.

³⁶ On the impersonal use of *paeniteo*, see Lewis-Short, ad loc.

³⁷ This is the reading of the preliminary critical text in Aejmelaeus' edition.

viciously objectionable to some. To change the verb to παρακαλέω ‘to comfort’ removes this theological problem and provides a more concordant translation as well, but, on the other hand, makes poor sense – “an artificial, καίγε-type rendering that only serves the purpose of not attributing human behaviour to God.”³⁸ Brock, too, is certain that παρακέκλημαι is secondary and probably from Theodotion.³⁹ Accordingly, Tertullian and *L* agree in the original reading.

15:11 תִּחְיֶה נַפְשִׁי לְפָנֶיךָ יְיָ הַמֶּלֶךְ הַגָּדוֹל ὅτι ἐβασίλευσα τὸν Σαουλ εἰς βασιλέα

ἐβασίλευσα B O L b 244*(vid) 460 Tert *Marc.* 2,24,11 (*regem fecerim*)
Ge^{DOS} = MT] ἔχρισα C' -236.242.530 *a d f h s* -92.488.762 71 245 554 La¹¹⁶ (La^M)
Sa; εχρησα V 236-242-530 92-488 55 158 318 707; εχρεισα 29; > A
εἰς βασιλέα] > Tert *Marc.* 2,24,11

The Latin evidence is best given in full. (Those corresponding best to the B-text first.)

poenitet me quod constituerim Saul in regem Aug *Leg.* 1,42b⁴⁰
paenitet me quoniam con[st]itui Saul regem La¹¹⁶
penitet (paen. Luc) me quod constituerim regem Saul Aug *Div. quaest. Simpl.*
2,2,1 *Luc Parc.* 4 *Reg.* 2b⁴¹

poenitet me Saul regem fecisse Cassiodorus, *Romans* 11,29

*poenitet me quia/quod*⁴² *unxi Saul in regem* Ruf *Orig. Hom. Num.* 19,1
paeniteor quod unxi Saul in regem Ruf *Orig. Princ.* 4,2,1

paenitet me unxisse Saul in regem Apponius, *In Canticum Canticorum* 2,19
Aug *Leg.* 1,42a PsGreg *Concordia testimoniorum* 7 Optatus, *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam* 2,23

³⁸ Aejmelaeus, “Kingdom”, 355–6. Aejmelaeus stresses that it is not legitimate to postulate the meaning ‘to regret’ for παρακαλέω as LSJ does just because it is found as a rendering of a Hebrew verb with that meaning. Bernard A. Taylor admirably translates the B-text in its all absurdity in NETS: “I have been comforted, because I made Saoul king, for he has turned away from behind me and has not kept my words”! Cf. also Muraoka’s (*A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* [Louvain: Peeters, 2009], ad loc.): “ironically said, 1K 15.11” with a reference to *La Bible d’Alexandrie* (9,1: *Premier livre des Règnes*; Paris: Cerf, 1997): “me voilà bien consolé d’avoir fait régner Saül comme roi.”

³⁹ Brock, *Recensions*, 79, 139.

⁴⁰ Augustine quotes the words in two different forms, referred to as *Leg.* 1,42a and b: *idem tamen samuel, cui dixerat deus: paenitet me unxisse saul in regem, dicit euidenter deum non paenitere. nam ita scriptum est: et factum est uerbum domini ad samuel dicens: paenitet me quod constituerim saul in regem, quoniam auersus est a me et uerba mea non custodiuit[.]* (PL 42)

⁴¹ Two quotations by Lucifer (*Reg.* 2a, 2b): *ipsum etiam saul inuenimus, contra domini mandatum quia fecerit, quod fuerit reprobatus et tamen diu regnauerit post reprobationem, posteaquam dixit ad samuhel deus: paenitet me unxisse in regem saul... et factum est uerbum domini ad samuhelem dicens: paenitet me quod constituerim regem saul, quoniam auersus est a me et uerba mea non statuit.*

⁴² There are two quotations near each other, the former (GCS 30, p. 180, line 7) reading *quia* and the latter (line 11) reading *quod*.

paenitet me unxisse in regem Saul Luc Reg. 2a
poenitet me Saulem unxisse regem in Israel Pelagius II, *Epistulae* 5,8

paenitet me Saul elegisse in regnum *Glosa psalmorum ex traditione seniorum*
 105,45,4

Brock's lucid evaluation of this variation unit is: "Since Bya₂ [= B b] as a group are not elsewhere influenced by the fifth column, ἐβασίλευσα will be original. The variant is in fact due to contamination with verse 17."⁴³ Aejmelaeus, however, argues that the OG reading is ἔχρισα, which reflects a *Vorlage* כִּי מִשַּׁחֲתִי אֶת שָׂאוּל לְמֶלֶךְ (מִשַּׁח + object + לְמֶלֶךְ is a frequently occurring idiom, e.g., 1 Sam 15:1, 17), which in turn should be preferred over the MT reading. The reading ἐβασίλευσα is a very early approximation to מִלְכָּתִי. Aejmelaeus suggests that Tertullian's reading *quod regem fecerim Saul* could be his own formulation "according to a Greek manuscript known in his area."⁴⁴ The problem of Tertullian's attestation to this secondary reading is further diminished by the brevity of his quotation: since he does not quote the words εἰς βασιλεία, in such a short quotation it is natural to say "made king" rather than just "anointed." In any case, Tertullian's reading seems to be free of influence from the other Old Latin readings.

5.2.5 *De Fuga in Persecutione* 2,7 = 1 Sam 16:14

1 Sam 16:14 (Rahlfs) Tert *Fug.* 2,7

1 Sam 16:14 (Ant)

Καὶ πνεῦμα κυρίου ἀπέστη ἀπὸ Σαουλ, καὶ ἔπνιγεν αὐτὸν πνεῦμα πονηρὸν παρὰ κυρίου.	Aut enim ex causa probationis con- ceditur ei ius temptationis prouocato uel prouocanti, ut in superioribus, aut ex causa reprobationis traditur ei peccator, quasi carnifici in poenam, ut saul, – “ <i>et abscessit</i> ”, inquit, “ <i>spiritus</i> <i>domini a saule,</i> <i>et concutiebat eum</i> <i>spiritus nequam</i> <i>a domino</i> <i>et suffocabat eum</i> ” –, aut ex causa cohibitionis, ut aposto- lus refert datum sibi sudem ange- lum satanae, ut colaphizaretur nec hanc speciem permitti diabolo in sanctos humiliandos per carnis ue-	καὶ πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἀπέστη ἀπὸ Σαούλ, καὶ συνεῖχεν αὐτὸν πνεῦμα πονηρὸν παρὰ Κυρίου, καὶ ἔπνιγεν αὐτόν.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

⁴³ Brock, *Recensions*, 79.

⁴⁴ Aejmelaeus, “Kingdom”, 357–8.

xationem, <nisi> [simul] ut et uirtus
tolerantiae scilicet in infirmitate
perfici possit.

16:14 וְיִהְיֶה סָרָה מֵעַם שְׂאוֹל καὶ πνεῦμα κυρίου ἀπέστη ἀπὸ Σαουλ

ἀπέστη] ante πνεῦμα tr Didymos *Fr. Ps.* 791a Tert *Fug.* 2,7

While otherwise quoting exactly, Tertullian moves the predicate to the beginning.

16:14 וַיִּבְעֲתֵהוּ רוּחַ־רָעָה מֵאֵת יְהוָה καὶ ἔπνιγεν αὐτὸν πνεῦμα πονηρὸν παρὰ κυρίου

καὶ ἔπνιγεν Tht *I Reg.* 564] pr καὶ συνέχει αὐτόν 158; καὶ συνεῖχεν *L*^{-108mg} 509 Tht *Schol.* 37; *concutiebat* Tert *Fug.* 2,7; *conprehendit* La^M Aug *Div. quaest. Simpl.* 2,1,4 *Spec.* 29 Euch *Comm. Reg.* 50:1066d

Hexaplaric: ἔπνιγεν] α' (> 243) ἐθάμβει 243-731(s nom); σ' συνεῖχεν 243-731(s nom) 554

ἔπνιγεν αὐτόν] tr post κυρίου 460

κυρίου = MT] + καὶ ἔπνιγεν αὐτόν *L*⁴⁵; + *et suffocabat eum* La^M Aug *Div. quaest. Simpl.* 2,1,4 *Spec.* 29 Euch *Comm. Reg.* 50:1066d Tert *Fug.* 2,7

There are a number of Latin witnesses that very likely attest the B-text:

et exagitabat eum spiritus Dei malus Hesychius, *In Leviticum* 6

et suffocabat eum spiritus malignus a Domino Ruf Orig. *Comm. Rom.* 7,1

et suffocabat eum spiritus malignus Jerome, *Comm. Ps.* 9

et suffocabat eum spiritus malus Pseudo-Pelagius, *De induratione cordis Pharaonis* 40

et obstupescit eum spiritus malignus a Domino Ruf Orig. *Hom. Num.* 15,1

Spiritus Domini malus irruebat in Saul Isid *Sententiarum* 3,5,6

et prefocabat eum spiritus pessimus Pseudo-Philo, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 60,1

(*legimus quod*) *suffocabat Saul spiritus malus domini* Euch *Instructionum ad Salonium* 1

et exagitabat eum spiritus nequam a Domino Vg.

⁴⁵ MS 509 has a parablepsis from κυρίου to the same word in verse 15. If its exemplar attested the plus as well as συνεῖχεν for ἔπνιγεν, it has vanished together with the major part of verse 15.

The variation is threefold: it concerns a. the number of verbs and b. the type of the verbs corresponding to וּבִעַתָּהוּ of the MT, and c. the sequence of the expressions. The LXX translators are very inconsistent in their renderings of the verb בִּעַת, which in *pi'el* means either ‘to fall upon,’ ‘to overwhelm,’ ‘to assail,’ or ‘to terrify.’ Neither πνίγω ‘to choke, strangle, vex, torment’ nor συνέχω ‘to keep together, occupy, detain, constrain’ is an impossible rendering, but nevertheless, they are not found elsewhere, except πνίγω with no variants in the following verse (these are the only occurrences of the verb in the LXX). The verb συνέχω, on the other hand, is found as a counterpart to 17 different Hebrew verbs in the Tov-Polak alignment.⁴⁶

Brock notes that the reading συνεῖχεν (*L*^{-108mg} 509 *Tht Schol.* 37 and as a doublet in 158) is derived from Symmachus and in *L* the original translation καὶ ἔπνιγεν αὐτόν is displaced to the end of the verse.⁴⁷ As both Voogd and Brock note, Tertullian attests the plus at the end, but Brock states that “*concutiebat* hardly represents συνεῖχεν (=σ’).”⁴⁸ Voogd, however, supposes that Tertullian’s *concutio* reflects συνέχω rather than πνίγω.⁴⁹ The meaning of *concutio* in this context, however, is ‘to shake, disturb, to put in fear or anxiety, to terrify’ and thus it is closer to πνίγω. Moreover, La^M, Augustine, and Eucherius, who in all likelihood follow the Lucianic text, have the verb *comprehenso* ‘to lay hold of something on all sides; to take or catch hold of, seize, grasp’ for συνέχω. Voogd’s argument is likely based on the consideration that since Tertullian uses *suffoco* as a rendering for πνίγω at the end of the verse, *concutio* should reflect another verb – συνέχω. That would, however, presuppose that Tertullian was not familiar with the meaning of συνέχω and this appears not to be the case: he quotes two biblical passages containing the verb and gives a good rendering in both instances.⁵⁰ Accordingly, there is no actual agreement between Tertullian and *L* in the first verb but only in having the plus at the end of the verse.

The Lucianic text is probably secondary because it is fuller. Since the verse begins with the statement that “the spirit of the Lord departed from Saul” it is natural to say first that the evil spirit took possession of him and only secondly that the spirit tormented him. Tertullian’s text, however, does not follow this scheme; rather, he merely repeats the “tormenting” at the end. It seems there are two possible ways to explain the agreement. 1. If the agreement is genuine, one should consider the possibility that it is actually pre-Lucianic, perhaps a

⁴⁶ The most frequent one (12 times out of 32) being עָצַר ‘to hold back, detain, imprison.’

⁴⁷ Brock, *Recensions*, 154, 291–2. Brock also notes that “πνίγω was objected to by the Atticists”, referring to Moeris, *Atticista* α,125: ἄγχειν Ἀττικοί: πνίγειν Ἑλληνες.

⁴⁸ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 27, Brock, *Recensions*, 196, 197. Tov, “Lucian”, 111, gives the instance as an agreement between La⁹³ and *L*.

⁴⁹ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 27.

⁵⁰ Mic 7:18: καὶ οὐ **συνέσχευ** εἰς μαρτύριον ὀργῆν αὐτοῦ / *Marc.* 4,10,2: *et non tenuit* (*teneo* ‘to hold, keep, have, grasp, hold fast’) *in testimonium iram suam*; Jer 2:13: οἱ οὐ δυνήσονται ὕδωρ **συνέχειν** / *Adv. Jud.* 13,13–14: *qui non potuerunt aquam continere* (*contineo* ‘to hold together, bound, limit, comprise, enclose, surround, environ’).

very early doublet for יִתְחַלֵּף that has ended up in the wrong place. 2. If the agreement is coincidental, we must assume that Tertullian simply wanted to give another rendering for ἔπνιγεν in order to emphasize Saul's agony.

5.2.6 Against Marcion 2,24,7 = 1 Sam 15:28–29

1 Sam 15:28–29 (Rahlfs)	Tert Marc. 2,24,7 (CSEL 369)	1 Sam 15:28–29 (Ant)
καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν Σαμουήλ Διέρρηξεν κύριος τὴν βασιλείαν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ χειρός σου σήμερον καὶ δώσει αὐτήν τῷ πλησίον σου τῷ ἀγαθῷ ὕπὲρ σέ· καὶ διαιρεθήσεται Ἰσραὴλ εἰς δύο, καὶ οὐκ ἀποστρέψει οὐδὲ μετανοήσει,	Nam et hoc tibi eadem scriptura determinat, di- cente samuhele sauli: <i>discidit dominus regnum israhelis de manu tua hodie et dabit illud proximo tuo, optimo super te, et scindetur israhel in duas partes, et non conuertetur neque paenitentiam aget,</i>	καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν Σαμουήλ Διέρρηξε Κύριος τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ χειρός σου σήμερον, καὶ δώσει αὐτήν τῷ πλησίον σου τῷ ἀγαθῷ ὕπὲρ σέ, καὶ σχισθήσεται Ἰσραὴλ εἰς δύο· καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστρέψει οὐδὲ μετανοήσει ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπός ἐστι τοῦ μετανοῆσαι.
ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν τοῦ μετανοῆσαι αὐτός.	<i>quia non sicut homo est ad paenitendum.</i>	

15:28 יִתְחַלֵּף תִּכְוֹחַ מִמֶּנִּי הַיְּהוָה קָרָךְ διέρρηξεν κύριος τὴν βασιλείαν Ἰσραὴλ

βασιλείαν V CI a 381 29 71 158 245 318 707 Aug Leg. 1,42; Isid I Reg. 17,8 Tert Marc. 2,24,7 = MT] + σου ἀπὸ A B (O)⁵¹ L b d f 55 554 Luc Parc. 4 Reg. 2 (*tuum ex*); + ἀπὸ CII s⁻³⁸¹ 244 460 Aug Civ. 17,7 (*ab*)

According to Aejmelaeus, the longest text form (σου ἀπὸ) is the oldest surviving reading and goes back to a Hebrew reading יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעַד מִמֶּנִּי (like, e.g., 1 Kgs 9:5). The translator rendered this Hebrew reading as τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ. The reading ἀπὸ is an early scribal mistake.⁵² If the longest reading is closer to the original text the other two can be explained as deriving from it. The shortest reading (Rahlfs) corresponds most closely to the MT. It is very likely an early approximation:⁵³ although the witnesses for the omission of σου

⁵¹ In O the words πρὸς αὐτόν and Σαμουήλ are transposed, and the words ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ χειρός σου are displaced after the word σήμερον. The latter is probably a mistake originating in a parablepsis from the first σου to the second.

⁵² Aejmelaeus, “Kingdom”, 360–361. This is contrary to Brock, *Recensions*, 197: “The omission may be original.”

⁵³ Aejmelaeus, “Kingdom”, 361, suggests that the omission “may depend on Hexaplaric influence.”

30:28)⁵⁹; נחצה (*nip* ‘*al* pf./ptc., unattested in the MT)⁶⁰. If – as seems most probable – rendering a verb form, did the translator choose διαίρέω (majority) or σχίζω (*L* 554^{mg})? The verb διαίρέω is used as a rendering of חצה in Gen 32:8; Exod 21:35 (twice); Num 31:27, 42; Jdg 7:16, 9:43; 2 Kgs 2:8; Isa 30:28; and Ezek 37:22. It is not used elsewhere in 1 Samuel.⁶¹ The verb σχίζω, however, corresponds to either בקע (in 1 Sam once, 6:14)⁶² or קרע. If the translator was aware of the usage in the Octateuch and decided to follow that pattern, he would have more likely produced the reading διαίρεθήσεται than σχισθήσεται.

Another important factor is the translator’s interpretation of the passage. When Saul tears Samuel’s robe, the latter explains this as a sign of how Yahweh has torn the kingdom from Saul’s hands (1 Sam 15:27–28). The words “Israel will be divided in two” are a further interpretation of the tearing of the robe: the tearing of the kingdom of Israel, which took place after the reign of Solomon (ca. 925 BCE). The verb used in the tearing of the robe in verses 27 and 28 is קרע, rendered both times by διαρρήγνυμι. This verb is used in the LXX in the idiom of rending garments as a sign of grief, anger, or anxiety.⁶³ The choice of verb in verse 29 is understandably different, not only due to a different Hebrew verb, but because the division of the kingdom happens by tearing it in two, not ripping off a small part from a unity, as in the case of Samuel’s robe. The translator wants, however, to make a link between the expressions of tearing the robe and the kingdom. The difference between the verbs διαίρέω and σχίζω is not very great. The verb διαίρέω sounds a bit similar to διαρρήγνυμι in the conjugated forms in question (the common phonetic elements are *dia*, *r*, and *e*). Since its connotations point to division in a logical sense rather than enforced tearing, the choice of this verb could be the reason for the translator to add the words εἰς δύο. Accordingly, if the reading διαίρεθήσεται is indeed the original one, σχισθήσεται is easy to explain as a stylistic alteration by the Lucianic recensor – it can be more readily understood in a similar concrete sense than διαρρήγνυμι.

As for the Latin verbs, *scindo* corresponds to σχίζω;⁶⁴ apart from the same etymological origin, they have almost identical definitions in the major

⁵⁹ Smith, *Samuel*, 141.

⁶⁰ McCarter, *I Samuel*, 264. Brock, *Recensions*, 214, reconstructs this form as קח, probably a printing error?

⁶¹ It is used, however, four times in the other historical books: 2 Sam 19:30; 1 Kgs 3:25, 26; and 2 Kgs 2:8.

⁶² When cleaving wood: Gen 22:3, 1 Sam 6:14, Eccl 10:9; parting waters: Exod 14:21; splitting hills: Isa 48:21, Zech 14:4.

⁶³ With τὰ ἱμάτια as an object: Gen 37:29, 34, 44:13; Lev 10:6; Num 14:6; Josh 7:6; Judg 11:35; 2 Sam 1:11, 13:31; 2 Kgs 2:12, 5:7, 6:30, 11:14 (par. 2 Chr 23:13), 19:1, 22:11 (par. 2 Chr 34:19); Ezra 9:3, 5; Esth 4:1. This usage is adopted in the NT in Matt 26:65 and Acts 14:14. With τὸν χιτῶνα: 1 Kgs 21:27; in the NT in Mark 14:63. In Classical Greek the earliest example of the idiom that LSJ cites is ῥήγνυμι πέπλους in Aeschylus’ *Persians* 199, 468.

⁶⁴ The agreement is accepted as a proto-Lucianic reading by Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 26 and Brock, *Recensions*, 196, 214.

lexica.⁶⁵ The Latin *divido*, on the other hand, is a most natural equivalent for διαίρέω. This means that while Augustine is dependent on the reading διαίρεθήσεται, Tertullian might reflect a Greek text similar to *L*. If the reading σχισθήσεται is recensional, one is tempted to consider the possibility that Tertullian invented the reading without dependence on the Lucianic reading. In order to see a reason for such an invention, one must look back at verse 28 and compare the Latin readings there.

1 Sam 15:28 in Different Latin Traditions

MT	Rahlfs	Luc <i>Parc.</i> 4; <i>Reg.</i> 2	Aug <i>Civ.</i> 17,7; <i>Leg.</i> 1,42; Isid 1 <i>Reg.</i> 17,8	Tert <i>Marc.</i> 2,24,7	Bed <i>Sam.</i> 2,133; 2,134; Greg <i>Reg.</i> 6,43 = Vg.
קָרַע יְהוָה אֶת-מַמְלָכֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל	διέρρηξεν κύριος τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ	disrumpet dominus regnum tuum ex Israel	disrupit dominus regnum – (<i>ab Aug</i> <i>Civ.</i>) Israel	discidit dominus regnum – israhelis	scindit dominus regnum – Israhel
The LORD has torn the king- dom of Israel	The Lord tore your kingship from Israel	The Lord will break off your kingship from Israel	The Lord has broken off the kingdom of (/from) Israel	The Lord has torn the kingdom of Israel	The Lord has torn the kingdom of Israel

Tertullian uses the verb *scindo* already here, although with the prefix *di-* (*scindo* and *discindo* are practically synonymous). Since the other OL witnesses attest the verb *dirumpo* (spelled *dirumpo* in classical Latin) ‘to break or dash to pieces,’ the verb in Tertullian’s text could have been adopted by him as more appropriate.⁶⁶ The choice of the verb *scindo* in verse 29 could then be just conformation with the word adopted in the previous verse. In La^M, however, the same verb may be Lucianic influence.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ The common definitions of these verbs between LSJ and Lewis-Short are: ‘split,’ ‘cleave,’ ‘tear,’ ‘part,’ ‘separate,’ and ‘divide.’

⁶⁶ Tertullian does not avoid *di(s)rumpo*, but it is significantly less frequent in his texts (7 times) than *scindo* (48 times with or without prefixes). Another option would be that *discindo* results from contamination from the Vulgate in the MSS of *Against Marcion*. This option, however, should be confirmed with a much more striking agreement between Tertullian and Vulgate against other Latin and LXX witnesses.

⁶⁷ According to Brock, *Recensions*, 217 La^M as a whole is revised according to the Lucianic text. See p. 129.

15:29 וְגַם יִשְׁקַר וְלֹא יִנְחֵם וְכֵן καὶ διαιρεθήσεται Ἰσραὴλ εἰς δύο

εἰς δύο Aug Civ. 17,7 Leg. 1,42 (*in duo*)] *in duas partes* La^M Tert Marc. 2,24,7

While *pars* in Tertullian's reading *in duas partes* is likely just an explicative addition, it is interesting that it is attested by La^M as well. Augustine (or the translation used by him), however, does not consider it necessary to add the word *pars*. The choice of verb does not seem to play any role; all four combinations of *scindo* (with or without prefixes) / *divido* + *in duo* / *in duas partes* are well attested in Latin texts.

15:29 וְגַם יִשְׁקַר וְלֹא יִנְחֵם καὶ οὐκ ἀποστρέψει οὐδὲ μετανοήσει
4QSam^a: וְלֹא יָשׁוּב [וְלֹא יִנְחֵם]

ἀποστρέψει] ἐπιστρέψει *L C' 121 s 244 460 554; convertetur* Aug Civ. 17,7 Leg. 1,42 Tert Marc. 2,24,7 La^M (*poenitebit neque convertetur*)

Brock includes the variation unit in “striking instances of agreement” between Tertullian and *L*.⁶⁸ The semantic fields of ἀποστρέφω and ἐπιστρέφω do not overlap very much despite the common main verb. While ἀποστρέφω is used to denote ‘turning back or away’ in the sense of ‘return’ (intransitively), ἐπιστρέφω means to ‘turn about’, metaphorically ‘turn back from an error’. It is not easy to determine the original reading here: both verbs make sense in the context, and whichever is the original reading it undoubtedly goes back to a Hebrew reading יָשׁוּב preserved in 4QSam^a.⁶⁹ While יָשׁוּב *qal* is rendered with ἀποστρέφω only once elsewhere in 1 Samuel, this rendering is found 18 times in the other Books of Kingdoms.⁷⁰ The rendering ἐπιστρέφω, on the other hand, is found twice in 1 Samuel (7:3, 26:21) and 13 times in 2 Samuel. In Kings and the *καίγε* section of 2 Samuel it is the most frequent rendering, while in 1 Sam – 2 Sam 11:1 the prevalent rendering is ἀναστρέφω (53% of all the occurrences of יָשׁוּב *qal*).

In the MSS there is considerable variation between the verbs ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐπι-, and ὑποστρέφω, which all stress different aspects of the verb στρέφω.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Brock, *Recensions*, 197.

⁶⁹ This is observed by McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 264, who, however, gives the Qumran reading in *hip'il*: *yšyb*.

⁷⁰ According to Tov-Polak: 1 Sam 15:11; 2 Sam 11:4, 15, 18:16, 20:22; 1 Kgs 2:41, 8:35, 9:6 (twice), 22:33; 2 Kgs 9:15, 14:14, 15:20, 17:13, 18:14, 19:7, 33, 36; 23:26. Of these, 6 instances are in the non-*καίγε* sections and 13 in the *καίγε* sections.

⁷¹ The following data is compiled by going through the entries for ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐπι-, and ὑποστρέφω in the Hatch-Redpath concordance and collecting the variants in the collation books. The number is not the absolute number of the verbs in each MS but applies only to the cases in which there is one of the verbs in A or B. The verb ὑποστρέφω appears so infrequently (in these witnesses only in 247 [twice] and 376 [once]) it is excluded from the table below. The average is the weighted mean of the groups of

This variation is most likely an inner-Greek phenomenon.⁷² In *L* there is clearly no preference for ἐπιστρέφω and accordingly it does not qualify as a Lucianic recensional tendency.⁷³

Tertullian seems to attest ἐπιστρέφω: the verb *convertō* is a very good rendering for ἐπιστρέφω, in the metaphorical sense as well.⁷⁴ Moreover, in Tertullian's biblical quotations there is a clear pattern concerning the equivalents for ἀποστρέφω and ἐπιστρέφω: the former corresponds to *averto* 9 times (11 including paraphrases) and once to *revertō* in a paraphrase.⁷⁵ The latter, by contrast, corresponds to *convertō* 5 times and once to *revertō*.⁷⁶

However, although there seems to be a true agreement between Tertullian and *L*., the reading is supported by several non-Lucianic MS traditions (*C'* 121 s 244 460). Accordingly, Tertullian does not need to depend specifically on the Lucianic text tradition. The question may be of an early variant: above it was noted that in the καίγε sections ἐπιστρέφω is the most frequent correspondence for שׁוּב *qal*, but less so in *L* than in the other witnesses.⁷⁷ Moreover, there are

witnesses: e.g., for ἀναστρέφω the average for each group is A O: 13, B: 17, M: 13, L: 15. The total average is $(13 + 17 + 13 + 15) : 4 = 58 : 4 = 14.50$.

Number of Instances of the Verbs ἀνα-, ἀπο-, and ἐπιστρέφω in A O, B, M, and L in 1 Samuel

		ἀναστρέφω	ἀποστρέφω	ἐπιστρέφω	TOTAL
A		12	14	18	44
B		17	10	14	41
M		13	12	17	42
O	247	14	12	14	40
	376	13	11	16	40
L	19	15	12	15	42
	82	15	13	15	43
	93	15	9	18	42
	108	15	10	17	42
	127	15	11	17	43
AVERAGE		14.50	11.33	15.85	41.68

⁷² All four Greek verbs are found as equivalents to several different Hebrew roots and stems and there is little correlation between the variation and any of the Hebrew counterparts.

⁷³ Cf. Brock, *Recensions*, 264: "No preference [between ἀπο- and ἐπιστρέφω] is distinguishable in LXX for this book, or for 'Lucianic' mss elsewhere."

⁷⁴ The common English equivalents between these verbs in LSJ and Lewis-Short are 'to turn round,' 'to wheel about' and 'to return.' The only common equivalent between ἀποστρέφω and *convertō* is 'to turn back.'

⁷⁵ *Avertō*: Deut 13:17 / *Scorp.* 2,11; 15:7 (ἀποστρέξεις B alii, -στρεψ- tell) / *Marc.* 4,16,9; 32:20 / *Marc.* 4,31,6; Isa 1:15 / *Adv. Jud.* 3,5; 44:25 / *Prax.* 19,4 and *Marc.* 4,25,4; 50:6 / *Fug.* 12,2 (paraphrase) and *Marc.* 3,5,2; Jer 8:4 / *Paen.* 8,2; Hos 2:13(11) / *Marc.* 5,4,6; Jonah 3:10 / *Marc.* 2,17,2 (paraphrase). *Revertō*: Gen 3:19 ἕως τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι σε εἰς τὴν γῆν / *Marc.* 3,8,6 *per mortem reuertentis in terram*.

⁷⁶ *Convertō*: Isa 49:6 / *Prax.* 11,5; Jer 8:4 ἐπιστρέφει (ἀναστρ. B-410 O-Q^{mg}; ἀποστρ. 46 198 534) / *Paen.* 8,2; Ezek 8:17 ὄψει (pr. ἐπιστρεψας O(Q^{mg})-62 Arm) = Tert *Adv. Jud.* 11,2; 34:4 ἐπεστρέψατε (ἀπεστρ. B 130-233) / *Pud.* 7,18; Hos 6:1 / *Marc.* 4,43,1. *Revertō*: Hos 6:1 / *Adv. Jud.* 13,23. The equivalents for ἀναστρέφω and ὑποστρέφω were also checked, the latter even in the NT, but no occurrences were found.

⁷⁷ The following table gives the data from the καίγε section of 2 Samuel.

three instances in which the verb ἀποστρέφω is attested by all or almost all other MSS, but changed to ἐπιστρέφω in the Nahal Hever Minor Prophets scroll (8HevXIIgr)⁷⁸:

Jonah 3:8 וַיִּשְׁבוּ (καὶ) ἀπέστρεψαν (-ψεν *multi*)] επεστρεψεν 130^F Cyr.
= 8HevXIIgr
Hexaplaric: α' θ' ἐπέστρεψαν Q Syh

Jonah 3:9 וַיִּשְׁבּוּ (καὶ) ἀποστρέψει] ἐπι[σ]τ[ρέ]ψει 8HevXIIgr

Jonah 3:10 וַיִּשְׁבוּ ἀπέστρεψαν] ἐπέστρεψαν 8HevXIIgr

While far from conclusive, these considerations suggest the possibility that the change from ἀποστρέφω to ἐπιστρέφω might be a καίγε feature.⁷⁹ As an early variant it may have ended up in Tertullian's text through another textual tradition than the one *L* is based on.

15:29 וְהִנֵּה הוּא אֵדָם כִּי לֹא יִנָּחֵם וְלֹא יִשְׁקַר וְלֹא יִתְנַחֵם וְלֹא יִתְנַחֵם καὶ οὐκ ἀποστρέψει οὐδὲ μετανοήσει, ὅτι οὐχ ὥς ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν τοῦ μετανοῆσαι αὐτός

μετανοήσει Tert *Marc.* 2,24,7] + ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ *L* 55 318 554^{mg} Ge
Tht *I Reg.* 561; + *dominus* Aeth Sa

Number of Instances of the Verbs ἀνα-, ἀπο-, and ἐπιστρέφω in *A*, *O*, *B*, *M*, and *L* in 2 Samuel 11:2–24:25

		ἀναστρέφω	ἀποστρέφω	ἐπιστρέφω	TOTAL
A		3	7	23	33
B		3	8	22	33
M		4	8	20	32
O	247	3	5	24	32
	376	2	7	24	33
L	19	8	5	13	26
	82	7	6	14	27
	93	7	5	13	25
	108	8	4	13	25
	127	7	5	13	25
AVERAGE		4.27	6.83	19.72	30.82

⁷⁸ See p. 4.

⁷⁹ Theodotion does not seem to have a preference between these verbs. In Field there are three cases in which the OG likely had the verb ἀποστρέφω but θ' attests ἐπιστρέφω: Ezek 21:30 (the attribution is to οἱ γ'), Jonah 3:8, and Mic 2:4. In addition, ἐπιστρέφω is found as Theodotion's equivalent to ושב qal in three instances in which the LXX has another verb or nothing at all (2 Kgs 2:18, Prov 2:19, Jer 22:27). By contrast, for the verb ἐπιστρέφω in the LXX, Theodotion attests ἀποστρέφω three times (Exod 16:10 [MT: וַיִּשְׁבוּ], Ps 146[145]:4, Jer 18:8), ἀναστρέφω twice (Ps 119[118]:79, Ezek 1:9), and ὑποστρέφω once (Ps 7:8).

The Lucianic plus is either a pious addition of the subject or is motivated by the Hebrew reading לְאַחַד נְצַח at the beginning of the verse (see above). Tertulian attests the short reading of B and the majority.

15:29 αὐτός A B O 121^{txt}-509 d⁻⁴⁴] > V L 44 245 707 Tht I Reg. 564(?) Tert Marc. 2,24,7; + (αυτος 554) απειλησει (-ληση 71) και ουκ εμμενει (-νη 158; ευμ. 530) V C'af s 29 55 71 158 244 245 318 460 554 707

This variation unit is analyzed in more detail on p. 174. According to Ulrich and Aejmelaeus the long reading is original.⁸⁰ Tertullian's attestation to the shortest reading, however, is *e silentio* and best disregarded.

5.2.7 De Jejuno 7,1 = 1 Sam 7:10

1 Sam 7:10 (Rahlfs)	Tert <i>Jejun.</i> 7,1	1 Sam 7:10 (Ant)
καὶ ἦν Σαμουὴλ ἀναφέ- ρων τὴν ὀλοκαύτωσιν,	Cum maxime <i>samuel offerebat holocaustum</i> (in nullo magis procuratam audimus dei clementiam quam in abstinentia populi)	καὶ ἦν Σαμουὴλ ἀναφέ- ρων τὴν ὀλοκαύτωσιν
καὶ ἀλλόφυλοι προσῆγον εἰς πόλεμον ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ. καὶ ἐβρόντησεν κύριος ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους, καὶ συνεχύθησαν καὶ ἔ- πταισαν ἐνώπιον Ἰσραηλ.	<i>et allophyli proelio admouebant</i> , ibidem <i>dominus intonuit</i> <i>uoce magna</i> <i>super allophylos,</i> <i>et confusi sunt et corruerunt in conspectu israelis,</i> <i>et processerunt uiri israel ex maspha et persecuti sunt allophylos et usque bethor ceciderunt...</i>	καὶ οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι προσῆ- γον εἰς πόλεμον ἐπὶ Ἰσρα- ήλ. καὶ ἐβρόντησε Κύριος ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους, καὶ συνεχύθησαν καὶ ἔ- πταισαν ἐνώπιον Ἰσραήλ.
7:10 לְאַחַד נְצַח מִמָּחָה לְיָשׁוּב וְיִשְׁלָחוּ καὶ ἀλλόφυλοι προσῆγον εἰς πόλεμον ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ		
προσῆγον / εἰς πόλεμον] tr Tert <i>Jejun.</i> 7,1 (<i>proelio admouebant</i>)		
7:10 וַיְהִי בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא לְיָדָהּ לְבָרָק הָיָה עִמָּוָה καὶ ἐβρόντησεν κύριος ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ		
ἐβρόντησεν κύριος] tr Tert <i>Jejun.</i> 7,1 (<i>dominus intonuit</i>)		

⁸⁰ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 142; Aejmelaeus, "Kingdom", 362.

The changes in word order exemplify Tertullian's freedom of quotation and do not reflect a different Greek text.

7:10 ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ] > ἐν *L* 98' 509 *f* 71 (sed habet Compl); *uoce magna* Tert *Jejun.* 7,1 (Cf. Vg. *fragore magno*)

Voogd gives the instance as an agreement between Tertullian and *L* in not having a preposition.⁸¹ The expression ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ could be Latinized as *in/cum voce magna* but such an expression is not found in Tertullian's texts. However, *voce magna*, instrumental ablative without a preposition, is frequent in Latin texts and it is found twice elsewhere in Tertullian's writings (*Adv. Jud.* 11). A preposition is actually redundant: simple *voce magna* is good Latin and may reflect either Greek reading.

7:10 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ = MT] ante (ἐν) φωνῇ μεγάλῃ tr *L* ⁻⁸²; > 82 Tert *Jejun.* 7,1

Tertullian's omission of this phrase reveals the inexact nature of the quotation (note the two transpositions at the beginning of the verse). In MS 82 the omission is probably due to confusion of many feminine singular dative endings.

5.3 Conclusion

For the most part Tertullian's quotations seem to be unaffected by other Old Latin witnesses. This strongly points to the conclusion that Tertullian used a Greek Bible which he translates himself. The most striking feature of Tertullian's quotations is that he makes frequent adaptations required by the context or the subject matter. However, Tertullian agrees with *L* and the majority three times in preserving the original reading against B:

2:8 καθίσαι B M 731^{mg} 527 *b* 68'-120-134 56 29 158 707 La¹¹⁵] + αὐτόν *L* rel Aeth La^M La²⁵⁰ La³⁰⁰ La^{400ff} La⁴¹⁰ Tht Aug Pseudo-Cyp Tert *Marc.* 4,14,5.6 (*uti sedere eum faciat*)

2:8 λαῶν A B *b* 68^c-122 56 Syh (÷)] λαοῦ *L* rel Tert *Marc.* 4,16,6 La^M La¹¹⁵ La²⁵⁰ La³⁰⁰ La⁴¹⁰ Aug (*populi*); *plebis* La^{400ff}

15:11 παρακέκλημαι A B O 93^{mg}-108^{mg} 121*(vid)] μεταμελέημαι *L* rel Tert *Marc.* 2,24,11 (*paenituit*); *paenitet me* La¹¹⁶

⁸¹ Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 26.

In two instances Tertullian attests an early approximation with several MSS against B and once against *L* as well:

15:28 βασιλείαν V *CI a* 381 29 71 158 245 318 707 Aug *Leg.* 1,42 Tert *Marc.* 2,24,7 = MT] + σου από A B (*O*) *L b d f* 55 554 Luc; + από *CII s*⁻³⁸¹ 244 460 Aug *Civ.* 17,7

15:29 ἀποστρέψει] ἐπιστρέψει *L C'* 121 *s* 244 460 554 La^M Aug Tert *Marc.* 2,24,7 (*convertetur*)

In two instances there is a recensional reading in *L* that Tertullian does not attest:

15:29 μετανοήσῃ Tert *Marc.* 2,24,7] + ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ *L* 55 318 554^{mg} Ge Tht; + *dominus* Aeth Sa

16:14 καὶ ἔπνιγεν Tht *I Reg.* 564 Tert *Fug.* 2,7 (*concutiebat*)] pr καὶ συνέχει αὐτόν 158; καὶ συνεῖχεν *L*^{-108mg} 509 Tht *Schol.* 37; *comprehendit* Aug

Two agreements between Tertullian and *L* are only apparent and thus without text-historical significance:

7:10 ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ] > ἐν *L* 98' 509 *f* 71; *uoce magna* Tert *Jejun.* 7,1 (Tert does not need a preposition)

14:24 τὸν ἐχθρόν μου] pr εἰς *L*; *de inimico meo* Tert *Jejun.* 10,11 (The preposition in Tert is due to Latin usage)

One reading is especially problematic. Tertullian does not follow *L* in the formulation of the entire verse, but might attest a plus found in *L*. The reading is either an early doublet or Tertullian's own adaptation:

16:14 κυρίου = MT] + καὶ ἔπνιγεν αὐτόν *L* Aug Tert *Fug.* 2,7 (*et suffocabat eum*)

Concerning the material analyzed here, Voogd presented six agreements between Tertullian and *L* against B.⁸² My analyses show that only two of these (2:8 αὐτόν/*eum*, 16:14 καὶ ἔπνιγεν αὐτόν / *et suffocabat eum*) can be accepted, but three others have been found: 2:8 λαοῦ/*populi*, 15:11 μεταμεμέλημα/*paenituit*, 15:29 ἐπιστρέψει/*convertetur*. Voogd also presented two agreements between Tertullian and B against *L*⁸³ but these are untenable. However, there are two other instances in which the agreement is clear: 15:29 + ὁ ἅγιος

⁸² Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 26–7.

⁸³ Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 26.

τοῦ Ἰσραήλ *L* and 16:14 *concutiebat* Tert συνεῖχεν *L*. Accordingly, Tertullian's agreements with *L* and *B* are five to two. While this vindicates Voogd's claim that "the majority of the readings are in accord with *Luc*,"⁸⁴ the numbers are very low compared to Tertullian's frequent special readings. It is the freedom of quotation that is Tertullian's most distinct textual trait, not his agreement with one or the other of the *LXX* traditions.

⁸⁴ Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 28.

6 Cyprian

6.1 Prolegomena

Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258 CE) was a highly educated rhetor before converting to Christianity. He was a bishop at the time of the persecutions of Gallus and Valerian.¹

The Old Latin witnesses are traditionally divided into two main groups, African and European.² Voogd concluded that Cyprian is a witness of the African group. He also maintained that Cyprian is accurate and consistent in his quotations. As for the Greek text underlying Cyprian's quotations, Voogd concluded that it "is predominantly in agreement with the Lucianic tradition."³ Bonifatius Fischer attempted to demonstrate that OL readings that coincide with *L* were known to Cyprian. Fischer's conclusion was that the *Vorlage* of the OL was of the proto-Lucianic type, but it had been corrected according to a Greek text of the B-type.⁴ Brock on the whole accepts Fischer's conclusions. However, he suggests that Fischer "perhaps over exaggerates the 'Lucianic' character of Cyprian's text."⁵ For the books of Kings, Rahlfs concluded that Cyprian used an existing OL translation, but the Greek text underlying it was not of especially Lucianic character.⁶ While the notion that Cyprian's text is not especially "Lucianic" will be vindicated in the analysis, on the lack of conclusive evidence about Cyprian using existing OL version(s) in his quotations from 1 Samuel that question is best left open.

There are quotations from 1 Samuel in three works:

De dominica oratione (*Dom. or.*), written 252 CE Consists of comments on the Lord's prayer – according to Kannengiesser, "more balanced than those of Tertullian ... [and] carefully pastoral in tone."⁷ The biblical quotations in this work are used to exemplify correct forms of prayer (e.g., Hannah's silent prayer, 1 Sam 1:13) or attitude towards God (e.g., "those who honor me I will honor," 1 Sam 2:30).

¹ Kannengiesser, *Handbook*, 625.

² See, e.g., Metzger, *Early Versions*, 327–8.

³ Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 36.

⁴ Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten", 169–171. See also Robert Hanhart's very cautiously formulated expressions of doubt in "Ursprünglicher Septuagintatext und lukianische Rezension des 2. Esrabuches im Verhältnis zur Textform der Vetus Latina", in R. Gryson (ed.), *Philologia sacra: Biblische und patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele zu ihrem siebzigsten Geburtstag* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 94–6.

⁵ Brock, *Recensions*, 194–6.

⁶ Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 142.

⁷ Kannengiesser, *Handbook*, 625.

Ad Fortunatum (Fort.), 258 CE Probably composed shortly before Cyprian's death at the beginning of the persecution of Valerian.⁸ It consists of biblical extracts with comments, concentrating in particular on martyrdom and the Book of Maccabees.

Ad Quirinum testimonia adversus Judaeos (Test.). The date and authenticity are disputed, but at least the third book is considered authentic.⁹ The main body of the book consists of biblical quotations of varying length, arranged loosely according to a common theme. The quotations from 1 Samuel are used in connection with remission of a sin against God (2:25), priesthood (2:35–36), that God is all seeing (16:7), and continence (21:5[4]).

6.2 Analysis

6.2.1 *De Dominica Oratione* 5 = 1 Sam 1:13

1 Sam 1:13 (Rahlfs = Ant)

Cyp *Dom. or.* 5

καὶ αὐτὴ ἐλάλει ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς,
καὶ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῆς ἐκινεῖτο,
καὶ φωνὴ αὐτῆς οὐκ ἠκούετο·
(+καὶ εἰσήκουσεν αὐτῆς ὁ Κύριος Ant)
καὶ ἐλόγισατο αὐτὴν Ἡλὶ εἰς μεθύουσιν.

Quod anna in primo regnorum libro ... Lo-
quebatur prece occulta sed manifesta fide,
loquebatur non uoce sed corde, quia sic
dominum sciebat audire... Declarat scriptura
diuina quae dicit:
loquebatur in corde suo
et labia eius mouebantur
et uox eius non audiebatur,
et exaudiuit eam dominus.

1:13 אַנָּה בְּלָלָהּ בְּלִבָּהּ וּפִיָּהּ לֹא שָׁמְעָה וְכִי
הָיְתָה לַיהוָה וְהָיָה לָהּ וְהָיָה לָהּ וְהָיָה לָהּ

ἠκούετο A B O b f 55 245 707^{txt} Aeth Sa Vg. Jerome, *Comm. Matt.* 1
Sedulius Scottus, *In Matthaëum* 6,6¹⁰ Compl = MT] + καὶ εἰσήκουσεν
(-σατο 19) αὐτῆς (αυτη 44-107-125-610 158 460) Κύριος (pr ὁ 93-108-127
318 554) M L C' a d 29 71 158 244 318 460 554 Cyp *Orat.* 5; + καὶ
εἰσήκουσε κύριος αὐτῆς s; + καὶ εἰσήκουσεν αὐτῆς ὁ θεός Chr *Anna* 2,2 4,5
Mon. 86 *Eclog.* 584

Against the originality of the plus in the Greek can be noted that there is every reason to add this kind of pious remark. On the other hand, since the plus

⁸ H. Koch, *Cyprianische Untersuchungen* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 4; Bonn: Marcus und Weber, 1926), 172–82, dates this work to 253, shortly before the persecution of Gallus.

⁹ Koch, *Cyprianische Untersuchungen*, 183–4.

¹⁰ Origen's reference to this verse (*Or.* 2,5) is too short to be used as a witness for not having the plus.

is lacking in the MT, the minus in A B etc. might result from pre-Hexaplaric καίγε-type correction. Although the MT may well present the original Hebrew here,¹¹ the presence of a Hebrew reading וישמע אליה יהוה (cf. Gen 30:22: וַיִּזְכֹּר וַיִּשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים אֶת־דַּרְחֵל וַיִּשְׁמַע אֶל־יָהּ) or the like in the *Vorlage* and the originality of the Greek majority reading translating it, seem to be the best explanation in this variation unit.¹² Accordingly, Cyprian and *L* agree in attesting the original reading.

6.2.2 *Ad Fortunatum* 4 / *Testimonia* 3,28 = 1 Sam 2:25

Cyprian quotes the verse 1 Sam 2:25 exactly the same in two contexts.

1 Sam 2:25 (Rahlfs)	Cyp <i>Fort.</i> 4	Cyp <i>Test.</i> 3,28	1 Sam 2:25 (Ant)
	Item in regno- rum i:	De hoc ipso in basilion i:	
ἐὰν ἁμαρτάνων ἁμάρτη ἀνὴρ εἰς ἄνδρα, καὶ προσεύξονται ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πρὸς κύριον· καὶ ἐὰν τῷ κυρίῳ ἁμάρτη, τίς προσεύξεται ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ;	<i>si delinquendo peccet uir aduersus uirum, orabunt pro eo dominum: si autem in deum peccet homo, quis orabit pro eo?</i>	ἐὰν ἁμαρτῶν ἁμάρτη ἀνὴρ εἰς ἄνδρα, καὶ προσεύξονται περὶ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Κύριον· ἐὰν δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἁμάρτη ἄνθρωπος, τίς προσεύξεται περὶ αὐτοῦ;	

2:25 וַיִּזְכֹּר וַיִּשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים אֶת־דַּרְחֵל וַיִּשְׁמַע אֶל־יָהּ ἐὰν ἁμαρτάνων ἁμάρτη ἀνὴρ εἰς ἄνδρα

ἁμαρτάνων] ἁμαρτῶν *L* 121 *a*⁻⁵²⁷ 68' (sed hab Ald) 245 Chr *Oppugn.* 3,8
Prod. Jud. 2,1 *Exp. Ps.* 49,7; *delinquendo* Cyp *Fort.* 4 *Test.* 3,28

Cyprian's *delinquendo* (ablative gerund) works well as an equivalent to the Greek active participle, but no distinction between its present (B and the majority) and aorist (*L* 121 *a*⁻⁵²⁷ 68' 245 Chr) forms can be made in Latin.

2:25 וַיִּזְכֹּר וַיִּשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים אֶת־דַּרְחֵל וַיִּשְׁמַע אֶל־יָהּ וַיִּזְכֹּר וַיִּשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים אֶת־דַּרְחֵל וַיִּשְׁמַע אֶל־יָהּ καὶ προσεύξονται ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ
πρὸς κύριον· καὶ ἐὰν τῷ κυρίῳ ἁμάρτη, τίς προσεύξεται ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ;

ὑπέρ 1° et 2° B C , ^{-243.530.731} 527 55] ὑπέρ et περί A M V *a*⁻⁵²⁷ 29 71 158
245 318 460 707 Aeth (La^M) Sa (Syh^{BarH}) (Syh^{IM}); περί et ὑπέρ 82-108-127^c
530^c Syr^J (vid); περί et περί O 19-93-127* 530* *b d f s* 244 554; *pro et pro*
Cyp *Fort.* 4 *Test.* 3,28
πρός] > Cyp *Fort.* 4 *Test.* 3,28

¹¹ McCarter, *I Samuel*, 54, does not even consider the contrary possibility!

¹² The plus is accepted in the preliminary critical text in Aejmelaeus' edition.

In Christian Latin, ‘to pray for someone’ is *oro pro aliquo* and therefore nothing can be said about the Greek pronoun behind Cyprian’s *pro*.

2:25 וְשִׁירָאֵי הַיְהוּדִים וְאֵי קΑΙ ἔὰν τῷ κυρίῳ ἁμάρτη

καὶ ἔὰν] ἔὰν δέ *L* 554 *Syr*¹ *Chr* *Oppugn.* 3,8 *Prod. Jud.* 1,1 2,1 *Exp. Ps.* 49,7 *Bas Asc.* 1,14 *Judic.* 6 *Or Mart.* 17 *Or.* 28,3.9 *Hom. Jer.* 13,1; *si autem* *Cyp Fort.* 4 *Test.* 3,28 *La*^M *Jerome, Orig. Jer. Ezech.* 5,4 *Ruf Orig. Hom. Lev.* 4,5 = *Vg.*

The original Greek reading is undoubtedly καὶ ἔὰν and ἔὰν δέ is a recensional stylistic improvement. In Latin, καὶ ἔὰν could be translated as *et si*, but the preferred rendering is clearly *si autem*, found in all the extant Latin witnesses for this passage. Thus Cyprian’s reading is not necessarily dependent on the *L* reading, as Tov¹³ suggests. Rather, Cyprian takes into account the context, which clearly suggests juxtaposition: “if, by contrast ...” is *si autem* in fluent Latin.

2:25 ἁμάρτη (2°) *Chr Prod. Jud.* 1,1 2,1] + ἄνθρωπος *L* 799 318 554 *Chr Oppugn.* 3,8; + ἀνὴρ *Compl*; + *homo* *Ambrose, Paen.* 1,40 *Cyp Fort.* 4 *Test.* 3,28 *Hilary of Poitiers, Collect.* 62,8; + *sacerdos* *La*^M *Aug Ep.* 3

There are several combinations of readings in the witnesses for the expressions ἔὰν ἁμαρτάνων ἁμάρτη ἀνὴρ εἰς ἄνδρα and ἔὰν τῷ κυρίῳ ἁμάρτη (ἄνθρωπος).

ἀνὴρ εἰς ἄνδρα / –	A B O and the majority of the MSS
ἄνθρωπος εἰς ἄνθρωπον / –	<i>Chr Prod. Jud.</i> 1,1 2,1
ἀνὴρ εἰς ἄνδρα / ἀνὴρ	<i>Compl</i> : cf. MT (וְשִׁירָאֵי הַיְהוּדִים, וְשִׁירָאֵי)
ἀνὴρ εἰς ἄνδρα / ἄνθρωπος	82-93-127 799 318 554 <i>Chr Oppugn.</i> 3,8
<i>vir adversus virum</i> / <i>homo</i>	<i>Cyp Fort.</i> 4 <i>Test.</i> 3,28
ἄνθρωπος εἰς ἄνδρα / ἄνθρωπος	19'

Chrysostom’s testimony is ambiguous. It seems that he attests the minus of ἄνθρωπος in three quotations (*Prod. Jud.* 1,1 [and repeated in 2,1], *Exp. Ps.* 49,7, and *Hom. Matt.* 75,5), but these quotations have singular variants. Cyprian certainly attests the plus¹⁴ and in all likelihood the reading ἄνθρωπος with *L* 799 318 554: in Cyprian’s quotations from the LXX *vir* corresponds to ἀνὴρ 13 times and to ἄνθρωπος only once (*Exod* 32:1 / *Test.* 1,1). Likewise *homo* corresponds to ἄνθρωπος 32 times and only once to ἀνὴρ (*Prov* 28:14 / *Test.* 3,20).

¹³ Tov, “Lucian and Proto-Lucian”, 113.

¹⁴ The instance is included in Fischer’s (“Lukian-Lesarten”, 172) and Voogd’s (“Critical and Comparative Study”, 34) lists of agreements.

Since the plus is shared by a non-Lucianic MS 799 as well as Ambrose (d. 397 CE) it might be an early variant, perhaps a Hebraizing one corresponding to $\psi\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\eta\text{--}\eta$ in the MT. The Hebrew text, however, does not need to play a part in this instance; the context presents a strong juxtaposition of Lord and man and the word $\alpha\text{--}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ may have been added to emphasize this. Moreover, possible misinterpretation of $\tau\iota\varsigma$ as an indefinite pronoun may have led a copyist to add a clarifying word. Whatever the reason for the variant, it has found its way into both the proto-Lucianic text and Cyprian's Greek text.

6.2.3 *Testimonia* 1,17 = 1 Sam 2:35–36

1 Sam 2:35–36 (Rahlfs = Ant)

Cyp *Test.* 1,17

35 καὶ ἀναστήσω ἐμαυτῷ ἱερέα
πιστόν, ὃς πάντα
τὰ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ μου
ποιήσει· καὶ οἰκοδομήσω αὐτῷ οἶκον
πιστόν, καὶ διελεύσεται ἐνώπιον
χριστοῦ (**τῶν χριστῶν Ant**) μου πάσας
τὰς ἡμέρας.
36 καὶ ἔσται (+ **πᾶς Ant**) ὁ περισσεύων
(**ὑπολειμμένος Ant**) ἐν οἴκῳ σου ἥξει
προσκυνεῖν αὐτῷ ὀβολοῦ (**ἐν ὀβολῷ Ant**)
ἀργυρίου (+ **καὶ ἐν ἄρτῳ ἐνί Ant**) λέγων
Παράρριψόν με ἐπὶ μίαν τῶν ἱερατειῶν σου
φαγεῖν ἄρτον (+ **Κυρίου Ant**).

Item in basilion i deus ad heli sacerdotem: *et suscitabo mihi sacerdotem fidelem, qui omnia quae sunt in corde meo faciet, et aedificabo ei domum fidelem, et transibit in conspectu christorum meorum omnibus diebus: et erit, qui remanserit in domo tua, ueniet adorare in obolo pecuniae et in pane uno.*

2:35 $\psi\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\eta\text{--}\eta$ $\psi\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\eta\text{--}\eta$ $\psi\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\eta\text{--}\eta$ ὃς πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ μου ποιήσει

καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ μου] > Cyp *Test.* 1,17

The omission is in all likelihood just a special reading of Cyprian. Since “my heart” and “my soul” mean more or less the same and are not relevant for Cyprian's argument, he has abridged the text slightly.

2:35 $\psi\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\eta\text{--}\eta$ $\psi\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\eta\text{--}\eta$ $\psi\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\eta\text{--}\eta$... $\psi\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\aleph\text{--}\eta\text{--}\eta$ ἱερέα πιστόν ... καὶ διελεύσεται ἐνώπιον χριστοῦ μου πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας

χριστοῦ (χρηστου O) Aug *Civ.* 17,5 = Ald] κῶ 121 68'; τῶν (> 64') χριστῶν L 64' 554^c Cyp *Test.* 1,17 *Somn. Ner.* 11,6 (*christorum*); > 125 245^c(vid) Lactantius, *Divinarum institutionum libri VII* 4,14,5

There is hardly any clear reason why a copyist should change the singular to plural. It might have been done to avoid the connotation “before my Christ (Jesus)” in this context. In the pre-Christian era, however, there was no need for that, and a Christian scribe would hardly have felt that need. In the Hebrew the same consonants could be read as plural: **מְשִׁיחִי** (as in **בְּמִשְׁחִי** in Ps 105:15 and its parallel passage 1 Chr 16:22, the only instances of the word in the plural in the MT). If the change to plural in Greek had been a Hebraizing correction in this direction, it should have relied on an early reading tradition. Also, the interpretation of the passage “And I will raise up to myself a faithful priest ... and he shall walk before my anointed (ones) for ever” as a prophecy that finds its fulfillment in Zadok¹⁶ who served as a priest for both David (2 Sam 8:17) and Solomon (1 Kgs 4:4) – thus, many anointed ones – might have led to the change to plural. None of these reasons, however, are very obvious.

2:36 וְהָיָה כָּל־הַנּוֹתֵר בְּבֵיתְךָ καὶ ἔσται ὁ περισσεύων ἐν οἴκῳ σου

The reading $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$ is without doubt a Hexaplaric addition that L shares.¹⁸ Even in Hebrew the word לָאֵל may be secondary.

¹⁸ So also Brock, *Recensions*, 195 n. 11.

A broader look at the context is in order before analyzing the variation between *περισεύων* and *ὑπολελειμμένος*.¹⁹ According to the prophecy of the anonymous “man of God” against Eli’s household, God had promised that Eli’s family “should go in and out before me forever.” However, because those who despise God “shall be treated with contempt” (2:30), the strength of Eli’s family will be “cut off” so that no one in it “will live to old age” (2:31–32). In verse 2:33, though, the prophecy becomes more unclear: *וְאִישׁ לֹא-אֶכְרִית לְךָ מִנֶּמֶס מִזִּבְחִי* וְכָל-מִרְבִּית בֵּיתְךָ יָמוּתוּ אֲנָשִׁים לְכָלוֹת אֶת-עֵינֶיךָ וְלֹא-דִיב אֶת-נַפְשְׁךָ “The only one of you whom I shall not cut off from my altar shall be spared to weep out his eyes and grieve his heart; all the members of your household shall die by the sword.” The words *אִישׁ לֹא-אֶכְרִית* can mean “I will not destroy every man” (NASB) or “one man I will not destroy”²⁰ or “I will not destroy anyone.”²¹ The expression “cutting off from my altar” is not found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.²² The words are usually interpreted as a prediction of the massacre of the priests of Nob by Saul (1 Sam 22:6–23).²³ If this was really the author’s intention, he must have meant “only one” – i.e. Abiathar – “will be left to serve at my altar.” The text goes on: “so that your [more probably “his” with the LXX and 4QSam^a ²⁴] eyes should become weak and his *nefesh* should ‘pine away’” (transl. mine). This could mean overwhelming grief, as many translations (NRSV, NASB, NET) suggest, or, as the NJB suggests, it depicts old age: “his eyes to go blind and his soul to wither. The verse ends with a statement: “all the increase of your house will die in the prime of life” (NASB; NRSV follows the LXX, see below), word for word: “will die [as] men.” However, the text appears to be corrupt, which is suggested in several commentaries and modern versions.²⁵

¹⁹ For the origin, form and genre of the passage, see A.F. Campbell, *1 Samuel* (FOTL 7; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 51–9. According to Campbell, a Deuteronomistic authorship is not at all clear (p. 54). McCarter, however, attributes the passage to “the Josianic historian” (McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 93).

²⁰ Cf. NRSV (and ESV): “The only one of you **whom** I shall not cut off.”

²¹ The construction *לֹא* + *אִישׁ* means ‘no one’ clearly in, e.g., Gen 41:44; Exod 10:23, 34:3; 1 Sam 11:13, 30:2. Regarding *לְךָ*: According to HALOT, *כָּרַת* *לְךָ* + *לְ* means ‘to destroy someone/something for [or, rather, “pertaining/belonging to”] someone’: 1 Kgs 14:10 *וְהָכַרְתִּי לְיִרְבְּעָם מִשְׁתֵּינִי* “I will cut off from Jeroboam every male” (similarly 21:21 and 2 Kgs 9:8 with Ahab), Isa 14:22 *וְהָכַרְתִּי לְעֹר וּלְצִידוֹן* “and will cut off from Babylon name and remnant”, Jer 47:4 *וְהָכַרְתִּי לְעֹר וּלְצִידוֹן* “to cut off from Tyre and Sidon every helper that remains”, Mal 2:12 *יָכַרְתָּ יְהוָה לְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר* “May the LORD cut off ... anyone who (does this).”

²² Cf., however, Jer 33:18: *וְלִכְהֹנִים הַלְוִיִּם לֹא-יָכַרְתָּ אִישׁ מִלִּפְנֵי מַעֲלָה עוֹלָה* “And the levitical priests shall never lack a man in my presence to offer burnt offerings.”

²³ Most commentaries suggest a specific set of events as fulfillment of the prophecy (see e.g. Campbell, *1 Samuel*, 53–4; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 92–3; Smith, *Samuel*, 23–4): death of Hophni and Phinehas – the battle of Ebenezer-Aphek (1 Sam 4:11); cutting off of the Elides – the massacre in Nob; the appearance of the faithful priest – Zadok becomes the confident priest in the institution of Solomon (1 Kgs 1) and subsequently Abiathar is banished (1 Kgs 2:27); the beggar-priest – the relegation of the non-Jerusalemite priests to a secondary status in the temple during the Josianic reform (2 Kgs 23:8–9).

²⁴ See Smith, *Samuel*, 24; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 89. These commentators accept the emendation *לְהַדְאִיב* (דוב *hip’il*) for *לְאֹדִיב* (cf. the expression *נֹפֶשׁ נֹפֶשׁ* “what consumes the *nefesh*” in Lev 26:16).

²⁵ Smith, *Samuel*, 22; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 86, 89; ESV, NAB, NRSV, and NJB follow (more or less) the LXX and 4QSam^a.

1 Sam 2:33 in Different Textual Traditions

MT 4QSam^a = LXX *Vorlage*? Rahlfs

וְאִישׁ	[וְאִישׁ]	καὶ ἄνδρα
לֹא־אֲכַרִּית לָךְ	[לֹא אֲכַרִּית לָךְ]	οὐκ ²⁶ ἐξολεθρεύσω σοι
מִעַם מִזְבְּחִי	[מִעַם] מִזְבְּחִי	ἀπὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου μου
לְכָלוֹת אֶת־עֵינֶיךָ	לְכָלוֹת א[ת] עֵינֶיךָ	ἐκλιπεῖν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ
וְלֹא־דִיב אֶת־נַפְשְׁךָ	[וְלֹא־דִיב אֶת־נַפְשְׁךָ]	καὶ καταρρεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ,
וְכָל־מַרְבִּית בֵּיתְךָ	[וְכָל־מַרְבִּית בֵּיתְךָ]	καὶ πᾶς περισσεύων οἴκου σου
יָמוּתוּ אֲנָשִׁים	יָפֹלּוּ בַּחֲרָב אֲנָשִׁים	πεσοῦνται ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ ἀνδρῶν.

A much more understandable text than that of the MT is found in the LXX and 4QSam^a: “every one that remains [in Eli’s house] shall fall by the sword of men” (Brenton). This means that according to these witnesses every Elide will meet a violent death. The minus of οὐκ before the verb ἐξολεθρεύσω in a great number of LXX witnesses (see n. 26) also emphasizes the tragedy of the Elides: “I will cut every one²⁷ of your men from my altar.” All in all, in the MT the punishment is not extremely severe, while in the LXX and 4QSam^a the consequences of Eli’s sons’ disobedience are harsher.

Verse 2:36 is very likely a prediction of the relegation of the non-Jerusalemite priests to a secondary status in the temple during the Josianic reform (2 Kgs 23:8–9).²⁸ Whether in Hebrew or Greek, verse 36 presupposes that there is indeed an Elide left to experience the humiliation. The survivor of Nob, Abiathar, was no longer there, and accordingly the survivor in verse 36 must be someone else regardless of the interpretation of the Greek text in verse 33.

After this rather lengthy survey on the context it is time to turn to the competing readings ὁ περισσεύων and ὁ ὑπολειμμένος at the beginning of the verse. If ὁ περισσεύων is a rendering of הַנּוֹתָר, the participle of יָתַר *nip’al* ‘to remain,’ it is the only one of its kind in the LXX.²⁹ If the translator incorrectly thought that this means the same survivor as in verse 2:33, in which περισσεύων ‘one that remains’ appears as a rendering of מַרְבִּית ‘majority, multitude, increase,’³⁰ this could have motivated him to use the same Greek word. On the other hand, the rendering ὑπολείπω for יָתַר *nip’al* is quite frequent: from Genesis to 2 Kings it is attested fifteen times, including once in 1 Samuel

²⁶ Pr. ὅν *L d* ⁻⁶⁸ 318 245 554; om. M V C’ *a f* 64’-130-489 29 55 71 158 244 460 707 La^M Aug Civ. 17,5 Luc Athan. 1,10.

²⁷ If the singular object ἀνὴρ in ἄνδρα οὐκ ἐξολεθρεύσω is taken as inclusive (“everyone”) rather than partitive (“someone”).

²⁸ See n. 23.

²⁹ To be sure, there are a few cases of some other form of περισσ- corresponding to יָתַר *nip’al*: Ezek 48:15 הַנּוֹתָר τὰς περισσάς, 48:18 הַנּוֹתָר τὸ περισσόν, 48:21 הַנּוֹתָר τὸ δὲ περισσόν, Eccl 3:19 וּמִוֹתֵר הָאָדָם καὶ τί ἐπερίσσευσεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος.

³⁰ Apart from this passage the verb περισσεύω is used elsewhere in the LXX only in Tob 4:16, 1 Macc 3:30, and Eccl 3:19 (where it may render יָתַר) (Tov-Polak). The word מַרְבִּית appears only five times in the Hebrew Bible: apart from 1 Sam 2:33 in Lev 25:37 (LXX πλεονασμός), 1 Chr 12:3 (πλεῖστον), 2 Chr 9:6 (πληθος), and 30:1 (πλεῖστον).

Moreover, περισσεύω seems to be the equivalent preferred by Aquila.³² It is likely that a Hebraizing corrector, rather than the translator, would have chosen just that verb.³³ Admittedly, it would be unusually widespread. Thus the reading ὑπολελειμμένος could be original. It could hardly be explained as a recensional Lucianic reading since it is attested by witnesses that do not characteristically follow the *L*-group.

2:36 יָבֹא לְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת לוֹ לְאַגֹּרֶת בְּסָף ἤξει προσκυνεῖν αὐτῷ ὀβολοῦ ἀργυρίου

³¹ See LSJ.

³³ Hebraizing correction following this pattern has probably taken place in a few other verses as well: Lev 2:3: “**what is left** of the grain offering shall be for Aaron and his sons” רַחֵם לֵבָדִּי τὸ λοιπόν (τὸ περισσεύον 118’-537); Judg 21:7: “what shall we do to provide wives for **those who are left** [of the Benjaminites]” (NJB) רַחֵם לֵבָדִּי τοῖς ὑπολειφθεῖσιν A (pr τοῖς περισσοῖς B 158); Judg 21:16: “what shall we do to provide wives for **the survivors** [of the Benjaminites]” (NJB) רַחֵם לֵבָדִּי τοῖς ἐπιλοίποις A (τοῖς περισσοῖς B, τοῖς ὑπολοίποις 58 106 134 344). The word περισσεύω is not found in 8HevXIIgr. By contrast, the word ὑπόλειμμα is attested by 8HevXIIgr in Mic 4:7 (together with all the LXX witnesses) and possibly in Zeph 1:4 where Tov’s reconstruction of 8HevXIIgr reads [τὸ] ὑπ[ό]λειμμα ’’] βααλ against τὰ ὀνόματα τῆς Βααλ in the LXX.

³⁵ Thus also Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 34; Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten", 172; and Brock, *Recensions*, 195.

According to the Hebrew text, “everyone who is left in your house shall come and bow down to him” (NASB), that is, practice the action described by the verb הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה to the aforementioned faithful priest. There are 170 occurrences of the verb הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה in the Hebrew Bible. With the possible exception of the present case, in none of them could the verb reasonably mean ‘to beg’. The lexicons and the *TDOT* suggest the meaning ‘to beg’ only here in 1 Sam 2:36.³⁶ When הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה is connected with material exchange, it is rather the one who offers a gift or a tribute who bows down: Jacob offering gifts of propitiation to Esau (Gen 33:3) and Abigail offering gifts to David for protection (1 Sam 25:23). Moreover, actual material begging is not the only possible interpretation even in 1 Sam 2:36. “Begging for a favor” is an equally adequate interpretation.³⁷ What the priestly candidate is coming to beg for or ‘implore’ is likewise a bit unclear since אֶגְרוֹה is a word attested only here. The Semitic cognate words suggest the meaning ‘rent’ or ‘wages’ and on the basis of these *HALOT* suggests ‘payment’ or alternatively ‘small coin’.

The standard rendering for הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה is προσκυνέω,³⁸ which does not mean ‘to beg for money and/or food,’³⁹ but begging may of course be implicit in this gesture of obeisance or greeting. It is possible that the translator understood the text as it probably was intended by the Hebrew author: “imploring him for something of value”⁴⁰ (NETS: “to do obeisance to him for a silver obol”), but nonetheless chose to use the standard rendering προσκυνέω and did the best he could with לְאֶגְרוֹת כֶּסֶף. If so, ὀβολοῦ ἀργυρίου was intended as a *genetivus*

³⁶ H.D. Preuss, “חור׃ hwh; הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה histach^avāh”, *TDOT* 4:248–56. Cf. also the suggestion in *HALOT*: “to **bow down**... – 1. before a higher person (Östrup 30ff): beggar 1S 2₃₆.” [J. Östrup, *Orientalische Höflichkeit*, Leipzig 1929.] In fact, the Hebrew Bible speaks very little explicitly on being a beggar, and no specific term for the phenomenon exists. Begging is surely meant only in Ps 37:25 (בִּקֵּשׁ *pi’el*), Ps 109:10, and perhaps in Lam 4:4 (שָׂאֵל *pi’el* in both; *HALOT*: “– 2. usually ‘to be a beggar’ Ps 109₁₀, so e.g. Gesenius-Buhl Handw.; KBL; Zorell Lexicon; König Wb. 475b :: Jenni Pi. 145” [E. Jenni, *Der hebräische Pi’el*, Zürich 1968]).

³⁷ The tendency in modern translations to avoid the verb ‘to beg’ here is very appropriate; e.g., “implore” (NRSV, ESV), “bow down” (NASB), and “bow before him” (NET). Note also “beg him on their knees” in NJB.

³⁸ It occurs 161 times in Tov-Polak and is the only equivalent in 1 and 2 Sam (24 times).

³⁹ The lexicons give some examples in which the verb is used in the sense of ‘to entreat’, ‘to implore’: Lampe: Isidore of Pelusium, *Epistulae* 1,490; LEH: Exod 11:8 (which Muraoka, however, includes under ‘to do obeisance, prostrate oneself.’)

⁴⁰ The verb הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה is already construed by the preposition לְ in לוֹ (the person or object before which one bows [*HALOT*]). The meaning of the preposition in לְאֶגְרוֹת כֶּסֶף is best understood as denoting the “aim, purpose of an action” (*HALOT*) – cf. E. Jenni’s classification: “Lamed Modi”–“Kausale Relation”–“Dinge als Anlaß” (Ernst Jenni, *Die hebräischen Präpositionen 3: Die Präposition Lamed* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000], 299).

causae, and no equivalent for the Hebrew preposition לְ was needed.⁴¹ The lack of the definite article enhances the possibility of this interpretation.⁴²

However, the ἐν + dat. construction in the reading ἐν ὀβολῳ (*L* 799 245 554^c) gives the impression that the one who comes is coming *with*, not *for*, a piece of silver (*dativus instrumenti, modi, or sociativus*).⁴³ The sense of “coming to implore him *with* a piece of silver” is not easy to comprehend. A reasonable explanation could be that the reading suggests that the only Elide who is left has to undergo an even deeper humiliation: he has to offer a bribe to get a priestly job. The verse is generally thought to foretell the fate of the non-Jerusalemite priests during the Josianic reform.⁴⁴ This is described in 2 Kgs 23:9: אַחֲיהֵם בְּתוֹךְ מִצּוֹת בְּתוֹךְ אֶם־אָכְלוּ בִירוּשָׁלַם כִּי אֶל־מִזְבֵּחַ יְהוָה בִּירוּשָׁלַם בְּתוֹךְ אֶחָיוֹם “Nevertheless the priests of the high places did not go up to the altar of the LORD in Jerusalem, but they ate unleavened bread among their brothers.” (NASV) The verse is not without difficulties of interpretation,⁴⁵ and it is probably impossible to estimate how a particular Greek copyist understood it. If, however, the “priests of the high places” who are “brought in” are thought to represent the beginning of a second-class priesthood that became the “Levites” in subsequent history writing,⁴⁶ the idea of “coming with a silver coin” could fit in that context; in order to secure even this kind of secondary status in the temple, it was

⁴¹ A translation of this kind, however, is not found elsewhere in 1 Samuel. There are 917 occurrences of the preposition לְ in 1 Samuel. Of these the translator renders only one (apart from the present case) with a genitive noun without any article or preposition. That case, however, is not comparable to verse 2:36 because there is a לְ-genitive in Hebrew: עֹבֵד לֵאֱלֹהִים (30:13).

⁴² As does the fact that not a single witness finds it necessary to add any preposition (e.g., διὰ + acc.) to clarify the meaning. The Sahidic reading *ha ouhobolos* “for an obol” most probably reflects the Coptic translator’s interpretation rather than any Greek reading.

⁴³ An instrumental meaning may be attested also by the reading ܐܘܒܘܠܐ in the version of Jacob of Edessa (but A. Salvesen, “Jacob of Edessa’s Version of 1–2 Samuel”, 142: “with a ... small coin”) – in any case, it in all likelihood reflects the Greek reading ἐν ὀβολῳ. The marginal reading ܐܘܒܘܠܐ ‘for the sake of’ makes this interpretation explicit. Salvesen (ibid.) asks whether the marginal reading represents a lost Greek reading or is Jacob “interpreting the meaning of ἐν in two different ways?” If the preposition ܐܘܒܘܠܐ is taken in an instrumental meaning, ܐܘܒܘܠܐ could have been added to clarify this.

⁴⁴ See n. 23. Modern commentators (see, e.g., M. Cogan/H. Tadmor, *II Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 11; Doubleday, 1988], 296) suggest that the story of the Josianic reform comes most likely from the same Deuteronomistic school as the prophecy against the Elides, and its historicity is doubted in modern scholarship.

⁴⁵ The “unleavened bread” (מִצּוֹת) can mean either the priest’s portion of the grain offerings or the cakes consumed at the Passover celebration (Cogan/Tadmor, *II Kings*, 287). The words “their brothers” (אֶחָיוֹם) can mean either “their fellow priests” (NET; NJB: “brother-priests”) or “their relatives” (NAB; NRSV: “kindred”). The translation “brothers” (or “brethren”: J.A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Kings* [ICC; ed. H.S. Gehman; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986], 531) leaves the decision about the precise meaning to the reader. Thus the verse can be interpreted (at least) in the following ways: 1. The priests of the high places were not allowed to minister the sacrifices, but they could share the Passover meal / the grain offerings with other priests (Cogan/Tadmor, *II Kings*, 287). 2. They were not allowed to minister the sacrifices, so they celebrated the Passover by themselves (this appears to be suggested in J.M. Miller/J.H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* [London: SCM, 1986], 398–9). 3. They were not allowed to minister the sacrifices, so they had to eat their daily bread among their relatives.

⁴⁶ Cf. Montgomery, *Kings*, 531: “It is to be noted that these country clergy are called priests, not Levites, as Dt. [= Deuteronomist?] has made the innovation.”

probably necessary to offer a gift – or bribe – to the high priest or other upper-level priests. Perhaps this was in the mind of the author of the reading ἐν ὀβολῷ ἀργυρίου.

There are several Latin readings:⁴⁷

1 Sam 2:36 in Latin Witnesses

Cyp Test. 1,17	Aug Civ. 17,5	Somn. Ner. 11,3	La ^M , Gloss. Bibl.	Vg.
<i>et erit, qui remanserit in domo tua, ueniet adorare in obolo pecuniae et in pane uno.</i>	<i>Et erit, qui superaverit in domo tua, ueniet adorare ei obolo argenti dicens: Iacta me in unam partem sacer- dotii tui man- ducare panem.</i>	<i>Et qui permanserit in domo ei- us, ueniet adorare in pane et vino</i>	<i>et erit qui superaverit [supererit La^M] in domo tua, ueniet adorare eum cum obolo argenti et pane uno dicens: proice me in uno sac- rifício [sacratio La^M] tuo man- ducare panem domini</i>	<i>futurum est autem ut quicumque remanserit in domo tua veniat ut oretur pro eo et offerat nummum argenteum et tortam panis dicatque dimitte me obsecro ad unam partem sacerdotalem ut comedam buccel- lam panis</i>
And it shall be that the one who is left in your house will come to honor with an obol of money and with one bread .	And it shall be that the one who will survive in your house will come to honor him by an obol of silver (abl. instr.).	And the one who shall hold out in his house, will come to honor with bread and wine.	And it shall be that the one who will survive in your house will come to honor him with an obol of silver and one (loaf of) bread.	But it will happen that whoever is left in your house will come and pray for him and offer a silver coin and a loaf of bread.

A few remarks on Cyprian's text. According to Lewis-Short, *venio in* is not used in the sense 'to come with/for'; *in* with this verb is exclusively local: "to come somewhere". Therefore *in* must be construed with the verb *adoro*. It seems that in connection with this verb, *in* + abl. may express the manner of addressing, at least in Christian Latin.⁴⁸ Thus Cyprian appears to understand the text in a sense that the one who asks to be admitted to "one of the priest's places" is actually bringing a gift. The construction in *Somnium Neronis* is similar, although instead of money, the priestly candidate is to bring "bread and

⁴⁷ Translations mine.

⁴⁸ E.g., Tert Marc. 4,36,2: *adorare in humilitate*; Ambrose, Spir. 3,11,72: *deus similiter adoratur in veritate sicut adoratur in spiritu* (cf. Vg. John 4:24: *spiritus est Deus et eos qui adorant eum in spiritu et veritate oportet adorare*).

wine.”⁴⁹ Augustine does not have *in*, but *obolo* in his text is most naturally understood as an instrumental ablative. The bringing-a-gift interpretation is explicated in the reading *cum obolo argenti* in La^M and *Gloss. Bibl.* and in the rather dynamic translation *et offerat nummum argenteum* in the Vulgate.

The reading ὀβολοῦ should be accepted as the original reading because it is widely attested, it makes better sense, and it can hardly be said to be closer to the Hebrew. However, in order to see how the other reading came about, one has to consider the origin of the plus καὶ ἐν ἄρτῳ ἐνί as well.

2:36 וְכַבֵּר-לְהֶם בָּקָר וְלֹא גִּזְרָתָא יְבֹא הָיְזַי προσκυνεῖν αὐτῷ ὀβολοῦ ἀργυρίου

ἀργυρίου] + καὶ ἐν ἄρτῳ ἐνί A O L CI^{-731txt} d^{-68'} f s⁻¹³⁰ 158 318 554
Cyp Test. 1,17 (*et in pane uno*) = MT; + *et pane uno* La^M; + *et in placenta una panis* Syr^{Jtxt} (*et propter* Syr^{Jmg})

The connection between this and the previous variation unit is due not only to the common ἐν + dat. construction, but also to the very clear distribution of the MSS:

Combinations of Major Greek Variant Readings Corresponding to וְכַבֵּר-לְהֶם בָּקָר and וְלֹא גִּזְרָתָא יְבֹא הָיְזַי in the MT

ὀβολοῦ	–	B M V 731 ^{txt} CII a ⁻⁷⁹⁹ b 68' 64'-130 29 55 71 244 460 707
ὀβολοῦ	καὶ ἐν ἄρτῳ ἐνί	A O CI ^{-731txt} d ^{-68'} f s ^{-64'.130} 158 318
ἐν ὀβολῷ	–	799 245
ἐν ὀβολῷ	καὶ ἐν ἄρτῳ ἐνί	L 554 ^(c)

The attestation to these combinations of readings very strongly suggests that the ἐν + dat. constructions in ἐν ὀβολῷ and καὶ ἐν ἄρτῳ ἐνί are interdependent. The reading with ἐν ὀβολῷ and without the plus is attested by only two MSS: 799 of group *a* and 245, an ungrouped minuscule (giving the short text in 1 Sam 17–18). These witnesses are generally free from Lucianic influence,⁵⁰ which very strongly points to the conclusion that their reading is just a corruption from the reading of B.

The plus καὶ ἐν ἄρτῳ ἐνί bears all the marks of a Hexaplaric addition: It corresponds closely to the MT, it is attested by chief Hexaplaric witnesses, and

⁴⁹ The editor's comment: "[I]n pane et vino I Reg. ii 36 is an obvious alteration of in pane uno (omitting at the same time the preceding in obolo pecuniae), made in order to bring in the Eucharist." E. von Dobschütz, "A Collection of Old Latin Bible Quotations: Somnium Neronis", *JTS* 16 (1915), 11.

⁵⁰ See Brock's manuscript grouping for "MN+" (*Recensions*, 19–20), in which 119 of the *a*-group is "n" and 245 is "v".

it is marked with an asterisk in the Armenian version.⁵¹ Fischer and Brock, however, suggest that the plus is pre-Hexaplaric because of Cyprian's support for the reading.⁵² Brock writes: "While the assumption that the asterised additions are hexaplaric will nearly always be correct, this does not mean that Origen may not at times have asterised something that was in some but not all of the LXX mss that he knew."⁵³ Fischer's and Brock's suggestions tempt one to consider whether there could be something in this short reading itself that suggests something other than a Hexaplaric origin.

The ἐν + dat. construction hardly corresponds well to the reading וּבֶכֶר־לֶחֶם of the MT – a reading which is itself curious; the preposition לְ should be repeated before בֶּכֶר־לֶחֶם.⁵⁴ The genitive in the manner of ὀβολοῦ would correspond more closely to the Hebrew construction. One explanation might be that Origen made the correction towards a Hebrew text וּבֶכֶר לֶחֶם, from which *bêt* has dropped out because of graphical similarity to *kāp*.⁵⁵ Another explanation for the ἐν + dat. construction could be that the addition was made to a text that already contained the reading ἐν ὀβολῷ. In that case the reading ἐν ὀβολῷ would have to be quite early.

We end up with two possible explanations for the combinations of these two readings: 1. The plus καὶ ἐν ἄρτῳ ἐνί is originally a Hexaplaric addition. It has been adopted by the Lucianic reviser who also produced the reading ἐν ὀβολῷ in conformation with the construction ἐν + dat. in the plus. This possibility does not, however, explain Cyprian's attestation to the plus. 2. The plus clearly comes to the textual transmission through one source only – this is suggested by the uniform ἐν + dat. formulation against the reading וּבֶכֶר of the MT. At a very early stage of the transmission, a copyist in the textual line

⁵¹ B. Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta* (Studia Theologica Lundensia 22; Lund: Håkan Ohlssons), 26.

⁵² "Cyprian geht gegen L, wenn Lukian hexaplarische Lesarten aufnimmt (... dagegen [the present case] ... wo der Zusatz wohl vorhexaplarisch ist)" (Fischer, *Lukian-Lesarten*, 173). "Cyprian's support strongly suggests that Origen has here included sub * an approximation already current in LXX mss" (Brock, *Recensions*, 65 n. 22). Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension*, 112, only excludes the possibility that the plus originates in Symmachus. This is based on the Symmachus reading κολλύρας ἄρτου reported in the marginal note for ὀβολοῦ in 554: σύμμαχος ἵνα μισθαρνήσῃ · ἢ κολλύρας ἄρτου "Symmachus: in order to work for hire; or [for?] a roll/loaf of bread" (according to "Sammlung hexaplarischer Noten"; according to Brooke-McLean the words stand "in textu post αρτον κῶ").

⁵³ Brock, *Recensions*, 55, and continues: "m's [= 92] note at xiv 42 actually suggests that this was the case." The scribal note in 92 mentioned by Brock pertains to the words ὃν ἂν κατακληρώσεται κύριος, ἀποθανέτω. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ λαὸς πρὸς Σαουλ Οὐκ ἔστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο. καὶ κατεκράτησεν Σαουλ τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ βάλλουσιν ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Ἰωναθαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ in 1 Sam 14:42, and it reads (trans. mine): "These [words] are only in Theodotion's version; I have preserved them because they are also in one or another of the [MSS of the] Seventy, but not in the Hebrew or Lucianic [MSS]."

⁵⁴ P. Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (trans. T. Muraoka; Subsidia biblica 14; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1996), § 132 g. Perhaps McCarter's (*1 Samuel*, 89) suggestion that the words are secondary in the Hebrew text is worth consideration: "[the shorter text is] evidently superior (note the mention of bread at the end of the verse)." Saley, by contrast, hints that the minus might be secondary even in the LXX (Saley, *Samuel Manuscript*, 50).

⁵⁵ It could also be suggested that the first *kāp* in וּבֶכֶר־לֶחֶם is a corruption from *bêt*, and the older reading was בֶּכֶר־לֶחֶם "with/for a *kōr* of bread", but bread is not measured in *kōr*-measures anywhere in the Hebrew Bible.

behind *L* disapproved of the genitive in προσκυνεῖν αὐτῷ ὀβολοῦ ἀργυρίου and changed it to the ἐν + dat. construction. A pre-Hexaplaric Hebraizing reviser attached the plus καὶ ἐν ἄρτῳ ἐνί to this reading. This could have been done by Theodotion. The resulting text form found its way to the text utilized by both Cyprian and the Lucianic recensor – this would explain the agreement. The plus was adopted by Origen in the fifth column of the Hexapla, and subsequently was added in the MSS that retain the original genitive ὀβολοῦ.

6.2.4 Testimonia 3,56 = 1 Sam 16:7

1 Sam 16:7b (Rahlfs)

Cyp Test. 3,56

ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἐμβλέσεται (ἀν ἴδῃ Ant) ἄνθρωπος,
(+ οὕτως Ant) ὅψεται ὁ θεός,
ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ὅψεται εἰς πρόσωπον,
ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὅψεται εἰς καρδίαν.

Dominum nihil latere ex his quae geruntur. .. item in basilion i:
homo uidet in faciem,
deus autem in cor.

16:7 בְּלִבָּב יִרְאֶה יְהוָה וַיֵּינִים לִירְאֶה בִּי הָאָדָם ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ὅψεται εἰς πρόσωπον ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὅψεται εἰς καρδίαν

ὁ δὲ θεός B V L^{-19'} C' a b 125 f s 29 55 71 158 244 245 318 460 707
Or Comm. Jo. 11,51] θεὸς (pr ὁ 19') δέ A O 19' d⁻¹²⁵ 554^{mg}; *deus autem*
Cyp Test. 3,56

ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὅψεται (post καρδίαν tr 509 107-610) εἰς καρδίαν A B V L^{-19'} C'
a b d^{-44.74.125} f 29 55 71 244 245 318 460 707 Or Comm. Jo. 11,51] > ὅψεται
O 19' 44-125 74 158 554^{mg} Cyp Test. 3,56

It is very uncertain which readings Cyprian actually attests. We cannot, of course, tell if his Greek text had the article preceding θεός, but we can say equally little about the word order: *autem* is the best rendering for an adversative δέ, and once it is chosen, *deus autem* is the only possible choice for either ὁ δὲ θεός, θεὸς δέ, or ὁ θεὸς δέ.⁵⁶ Consequently, Cyprian agrees only in not having the predicate ὅψεται with O 19' 44-125 74 158 554^{mg}. However, Cyprian uses the quotation only as a short proverb together with several other quotations out of context in order to enhance his point that nothing is hidden from the Lord (*Dominum nihil latere ex his quae geruntur*). The predicate is not needed for the correct understanding of the statement. Therefore the quotation is best classified as an *adaptation* (see p. 20) and it should not be used as a text-critical witness.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Differently Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 34 and Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten", 172.

⁵⁷ As, however, Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 34, Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten", 172, and Brock, *Recensions*, 195 do.

6.2.5 Testimonia 3,32 = 21:5(4)

1 Sam 21:5(4) (Rahlfs)

Cyp Test. 3,32

1 Sam 21:5(4) (Ant)

<p>καὶ ἀπεκρίθη ὁ ἱερεὺς τῷ Δαυίδ καὶ εἶπεν Οὐκ εἰσὶν ἄρτοι βέβηλοι ὑπὸ τὴν χεῖρά μου, ὅτι ἄλλ' ἢ ἄρτοι ἅγιοι εἰσὶν· εἰ πεφυ- λαγμένα τὰ παιδάριά ἐστιν ἀπὸ γυναικός, καὶ φάγεται.</p>	<p>De hoc ipso in basilion i: <i>et respondit sacerdos ad dauid et dixit: non sunt panes profani in mea manu, nisi panis sanctus unus. Si obseruati sunt pueri a muliere, et manducabunt.</i></p>	<p>καὶ ἀπεκρίθη ὁ ἱερεὺς τῷ Δαυίδ καὶ εἶπεν Οὐκ εἰσὶν ἄρτοι βέβηλοι ὑπὸ τὴν χεῖρά μου, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἅγιος; εἰ ἔστι τὰ παιδάρια πεφυλαγμένα ἀπὸ γυναικός, καὶ φάγονται.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

21:5(4) וַיֹּאמֶר הַכֹּהֵן לְדָוִד וְלִלְוִי וְלִכָּהֵן אֲרֵי טָהוֹרִים וְלֹא בְּיָדִי טָמֵא וְלֹא בְּיָדִי טָמֵא וְלֹא בְּיָדִי טָמֵא καὶ ἀπεκρίθη ὁ ἱερεὺς τῷ Δαυίδ καὶ εἶπεν

τῷ Δαυίδ / καὶ εἶπεν Cyp Test. 3,32] om 44-125; om τῷ Δαυίδ 328 Sa^A;
tr 93 74-106-120-134 554

The instance is included in Fischer's list as an instance of Cyprian's agreement with the OG against *L*, but this is no doubt due to a mistake: Fischer erroneously cites 19' together with MS 93 as a witness to the word order καὶ εἶπεν τῷ Δαυίδ and apparently assumes that it is the actual Lucianic word order.⁵⁸ In the absence of stronger support from the Lucianic witnesses the instance is best disregarded.

21:5(4) וַיֹּאמֶר הַכֹּהֵן לְדָוִד וְלִלְוִי וְלִכָּהֵן אֲרֵי טָהוֹרִים וְלֹא בְּיָדִי טָמֵא וְלֹא בְּיָדִי טָמֵא וְלֹא בְּיָדִי טָמֵא οὐκ εἰσὶν ἄρτοι βέβηλοι ὑπὸ τὴν χεῖρά μου

τὴν χεῖρά μου] *mea manu* Cyp Test. 3,32

A special reading by Cyprian.

21:5(4) וַיֹּאמֶר הַכֹּהֵן לְדָוִד וְלִלְוִי וְלִכָּהֵן אֲרֵי טָהוֹרִים וְלֹא בְּיָדִי טָמֵא וְלֹא בְּיָדִי טָמֵא וְלֹא בְּיָדִי טָמֵא ὅτι ἄλλ' ἢ ἄρτοι ἅγιοι εἰσὶν

ὅτι ἄλλ' ἢ] > ὅτι a⁻⁵²⁷ 44-74-107-125-610 Or *Sel. Ps.* 33; εἰ μὴ *L* 554^{mg};
nisi Cyp Test. 3,32

The expression ὅτι ἄλλ' ἢ is not normal Greek. It is found 18 times in the LXX and outside that only in quotations from the LXX.⁵⁹ The expression is used in (at least) two different senses: 'on the contrary' and 'except.' In all the 16 occurrences in Sam–Chr, at least one MS alters the expression – most often dropping out the word ὅτι. However, there does not seem to be any correlation between the (apparent) meaning of the expression and its treatment in the MSS – with the exception that the both occurrences of the change to εἰ μὴ (21:5[4] *L*

⁵⁸ Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten", 172: "καὶ εἶπεν τῷ Δαυίδ *L* (be₂ [=19'-93])." Brooke-McLean is correct.

⁵⁹ To be sure, ἄλλ' ἢ ὅτι is also found in Classical texts, e.g.: Plato, *Prot.* 334c.

554^{mg}; 2 Kgs 5:15 372) are found in verses in which the meaning is certainly ‘except.’ If ὅτι ἀλλ’ ἢ is accepted as original, the other readings display the tendency observed in all the occurrences of the phrase to simplify the expression somewhat. Unlike in the Greek MSS, in the sparse OL material available for the relevant verses a distinction is made between the two meanings of ὅτι ἀλλ’ ἢ: the Latin word corresponding to it is *sed* in ‘on the contrary’ contexts and *nisi* in ‘except’ contexts:

Greek and Latin Readings for ὅτι ἀλλ’ ἢ in Samuel–Kings

	Meaning	Greek variants	Old Latin
1 Sam 2:30	On the contrary	ἀλλ’ ἢ ὅτι <i>CI</i> 29; om ὅτι 74-125 s ⁻⁶⁴ 134	<i>sed</i> Aug <i>Civ.</i> 17,5 Greg <i>Reg.</i> 2,58 Isid <i>Off.</i> 2,5,6; <i>quoniam</i> Luc <i>Athan.</i> 1,10
1 Sam 21:5	Except	εἰ μή <i>L</i> 554 ^{mg} ; om ὅτι <i>a</i> ⁻⁵²⁷ 44-74-107-125-610	<i>nisi</i> Cyp <i>Test.</i> 3,32 PsPel <i>De castitate</i> 6,5,3
1 Sam 21:7	Except	ὅτι ἀλλ’ 460; om <i>O</i> ; om ὅτι <i>L</i> 328 <i>b</i> 44-107-610 56 381 71 554	
1 Sam 30:17	Except	ἀλλ’ ἢ ὅτι 242’ 381; om ὅτι <i>O L f</i> 44-125 158 245 318 460 554 ^{mg}	
1 Sam 30:22	Except	ἀλλ’ ἢ ὅτι 328; ἀλλά <i>L</i> ; om ὅτι 509 44-125 74 245 460	
2 Sam 13:33	On the contrary	ὅτι <i>A f</i> ; om 44-107-610 71; om ὅτι 68’-120	
1 Kgs 18:18	On the contrary	ὅτι ἀλλ’ εἰ 246; om ὅτι 19-82 52 372	<i>sed</i> Aug <i>Cresc.</i> 3,29 PsAug <i>Mirab.</i> 2,15 Luc <i>Athan.</i> 1,16.17 Mutianus <i>Chr. Hom. Heb.</i> 18
2 Kgs 4:2	Except	ὅτι <i>N</i> ; om ὅτι <i>A L</i> 130 129	<i>nisi</i> PsAug <i>Fulg.</i> 1,20 Caesarius, <i>Sermones</i> 128,1
2 Kgs 5:15	Except	εἰ μή 372; om ὅτι 44	
2 Kgs 10:23	Except (?)	ἀλλά 82; om ὅτι <i>L</i> ⁻⁸² 245 129	<i>nisi</i> La ¹¹⁵
2 Kgs 14:6	On the contrary	om ὅτι <i>L</i> 107 129	<i>sed</i> Aug <i>C. Jul.</i> 6,82 <i>Concilia Toletana</i>

While far from conclusive, this evidence points to the possibility that the Latin readings are simply *ad sensum*. This reduces the agreement between Cyprian and *L* as certainly not striking.⁶⁰

21:5(4) ἄρτοι (> 530) ἅγιοι (tr *CII*⁻⁵³⁰ *s*) Or *Sel. Ps.* 33] ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἅγιος (om articles A *d*^{-68'} 554^{txt}) A *L d*^{-68'} 554; *panis sanctus unus* Cyp *Test.* 3,32 εἰσίν] > *L d*^{-68'} 554

Cyprian clearly attests the singular.⁶¹ The word *unus* could have been added to emphasize that the bread is undefined, corresponding to a Greek reading without the articles (A *d*^{-68'} 554^{txt}). The word **ἄρ** is a mass noun in Hebrew and used only in the singular. It is, however, frequently rendered with ἄρτος in the plural (12 times in 1 Sam, the present case excluded). In the previous verse (21:4[3]) David asks Achimelech for five loaves of bread (**ἄρ**־הַמֶּלֶךְ **ἄρ**־הַמֶּלֶךְ πέντε ἄρτοι) and that several loaves were actually given is made explicit in the LXX in vs. 7(6): **ἄρ**־הַמֶּלֶךְ לֹא־יָתִיב וַיִּתֵּן אֵלָיו אַכִּימֶלֶךְ ὁ ἱερεὺς τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως. The following table compares the occurrences of **ἄρ** / ἄρτος in the near context.

ἄρ־הַמֶּלֶךְ – ἄρτος in 1 Samuel 21:4–7(3–6 LXX)

	MT	Rahlfs	Variants ⁶²
21:4	ἄρ ־הַמֶּלֶךְ	πέντε ἄρτοι	—
21:5a	לֶחֶם ἄρ	ἄρτοι βέβηλοι	tr <i>CII</i> ⁻²⁴² <i>s</i> 244 460 Ald
21:5b	ἄρ ־הַמֶּלֶךְ	ἄρτοι ἅγιοι	ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἅγιος (om artt. A <i>d</i> ^{-68'} 554 ^{txt}) A <i>L d</i> ^{-68'} 554
21:7a	ἄρ	τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως	ἄρτον προσώπου (pr απο et + κῶ 82) <i>L</i> ; om τοὺς ἄρτους 460
21:7baa	ἄρ	ἄρτος	ἄρτοι B <i>b</i> 55; ἄρτους 242; + ἕτερος <i>L</i> 554 Sa
21:7bab	לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים	ἄρτοι τοῦ προσώπου	om τοῦ προσώπου 460; + κῶ <i>CI</i> 29 Sa

⁶⁰ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 34; Fischer, “Lukian-Lesarten”, 172; and Brock, *Recensions*, 195, however, accept the instance as an agreement between Cyprian and *L*.

⁶¹ So also Fischer, “Lukian-Lesarten”, 172, and Brock, *Recensions*, 195. Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 34–5, however, overlooks the singular and gives Cyprian’s reading as *nisi panes*. Moreover, Voogd treats the plus *unus* as a special reading by Cyprian.

⁶² Variants concerning merely articles are ignored.

21:7bβ

חם חם לֶחֶם ἄρτον θερμόν

ἄρτους (αυτους 82-127 f) θερμούς
(ωμους 93) *L f 554^c*

The term ἄρτος is used to refer to three different kinds of bread: ‘permitted loaves’ (using the terms of NETS), ‘consecrated loaves’ (or ‘the loaves of the presentation/presence’), and ‘bread as such’. The ‘permitted loaves’ are always in plural in all MSS (21:5a), while the ‘loaves of the presence’ are unanimously plural only once (21:7bαβ; in this context the attribute is plural in the MT [הַמִּזְבֵּיחַ] but singular in 4QSam^b) but in other instances (21:5b, 7a) there is variation. Variation takes place regarding the ‘bread as such’ (21:4, 7bαα, 7bβ) as well. The greatest consistency can be seen in the combination of readings found in the majority of the MSS: “loaves of the presence” are always plural and “bread as such” always singular. If this is the original combination of readings, the variation to it can be seen as resulting from two competing tendencies: (1) change to singular in conformation with the Hebrew where חֶמֶד is not explicitly plural, and (2) change to singular or plural in conformation with the number in the near context. Relying on this hypothesis I will tentatively put forward the following scenario: The singular in 21:5b is Hebraizing; its attestation (A *L d*⁻⁶⁸ 554) suggests Hexaplaric origin. It motivates *L* to conform the number to the singular in 7a – this is very likely recensional. The MSS B b 55 get the plural ἄρτοι in 7bαα from the preceding instance; in 242 it might be a transcriptional error (ἄρτους for ἄρτος). The same kind of conformation to the plural happens in *L f 554^c* in 7bβ.

How should Cyprian’s attestation to the singular be explained? Cyprian hardly had a reason to coin the singular himself: the focus is not on the bread but on the abstinence (*Si obseruati sunt pueri a muliere, et manducabunt*): the whole chapter (*Test.* 3,32) is about “the goodness of virginity and continence” (*De bono uirginitatis et continentiae*). Cyprian’s attestation might point to an early Hebraizing variant. Theodotion could be the source, but he has no preference between singular and plural in his renderings of חֶמֶד.⁶³

21:5(4) πεφυλαγμένα τὰ παιδάρια ἔστιν] ἔστι τὰ παιδάρια πεφυλαγμένα *L*
Asterius Comm. Ps. 23,7; *obseruati sunt pueri Cyp Test.* 3,32

Cyprian agrees with B in having the predicative first but with *L* in the word order predicate–subject.

21:5(4) φάγεται A B O 121 d] φάγονται rel *Cyp Test.* 3,32 (*manducabunt*)

⁶³ The singular is found, e.g., in Job 24:5; Prov 20:17, 23:3, 28:3; the plural, e.g., in Lev 21:8, 17; 22:11; Josh 9:5.

While a subject in the neuter plural normally takes a singular predicate in Greek (A B O 121 *d*), in Latin a plural subject requires a plural predicate regardless of the underlying Greek text.⁶⁴

6.3 Conclusion

Cyprian's quotations from 1 Samuel are quite few, but there are some striking agreements between them and the Lucianic text. These witnesses agree three times in preserving the original reading with one or several other textual traditions against B and its companions:

1:13 ἠκούετο A B O *b f* 55 245 707^{txt} Aeth Sa Vg. = MT] + καὶ εἰσήκουσεν αὐτῆς (ὁ) Κύριος M L C' *a d* (s) 29 71 158 244 318 460 554 Cyp *Orat.* 5

2:35 χριστοῦ] (τῶν) χριστῶν L 64' 554^c Cyp *Test.* 1,17 (*christorum*)

2:36 περισσεύων] ὑπολελειμμένος M V L CI 29 71 158 318 554^{mg} 707; *qui remanserit* Cyp *Test.* 1,17

In three instances the agreement between Cyprian and *L* is very likely in a secondary reading that seems to be Hebraizing but probably is not of Hexaplaric origin. The question is more likely of an early Hebraizing reading – possibly by Theodotion – that has ended up in both the proto-Lucianic text and Cyprian's Greek text but has not been preserved in B:

2:25 ἀμάρτη (2^o)] + ἄνθρωπος L 799 318 554; + ἀνὴρ Compl; + *homo* Ambrose Cyp *Fort.* 4 *Test.* 3,28 Hilary of Poitiers

2:36 ἀργυρίου] + καὶ ἐν ἄρτῳ ἐνί A O L CI^{-731txt} *d*^{-68'} *f s*^{-64'.130} 158 318 554 Cyp *Test.* 1,17 (*et in pane uno*) = MT; + *et pane uno* La^M

21:5(4) ἄρτοι ἅγιοι] (ὁ) ἄρτος (ὁ) ἅγιος A L *d*^{-68'} 554; *panis sanctus unus* Cyp *Test.* 3,32

With a couple of other witnesses, Cyprian and *L* share a peculiar secondary reading which appears to be an early variant and may, in addition, be dependent on the plus καὶ ἐν ἄρτῳ ἐνί that follows it:

⁶⁴ Differently Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 34. To be sure, all Latin translators were not sensitive to this: Lundström, *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen*, 238–9, gives examples of singular predicates in Latin when the Greek subject is neuter plural. In Cyprian's biblical quotations, however, a Greek singular predicate for a neuter plural subject is always rendered in Latin with the plural. I found 15 instances of this, all in *Test.*: 1,4 / 2 Cor 3:14; 2,4 = 3,47 / Isa 59:3; 2,5 / Mal 2:7; 2,6 / Zech 10:11; 2,21 / Hab 3:4; 2,30 / Rev 19:14; 3,1 / Isa 58:8; 3,3 / 1 John 3:10; 3,28 / Mark 3:28; 3,48 / Zeph 1:3; 3,58 / Ezek 37:11; 3,59 / Jer 28:18; 3,62 / 1 Cor 6:15; 3,64 / Gal 5:19.

2:36 ὀβολοῦ] ἐν ὀβολῷ *L* 799 245 554^c; *in obolo* Cyp *Test.* 1,17; *obolo* Aug Civ. 17,5; *cum obolo* La^M

One agreement suggested by Tov (2:25), one by Voogd and Fischer (16:7 ὁ δὲ θεός), and two by Voogd, Fischer, and Brock (16:7 ὅψεται, 21:5) were found only apparent:

2:25 καὶ ἐάν] ἐὰν δέ *L* 554 Syr^J Chr Bas Or; *si autem* Cyp *Fort.* 4 *Test.* 3,28 La^M Jerome Ruf = Vg.

16:7 ὁ δὲ θεός] θεός (pr ὁ 19') δέ *A O* 19'^{d -125} 554^{mg}; *deus autem* Cyp *Test.* 3,56

16:7 ὅψεται] > *O* 19' 44-74-125 158 554^{mg} Cyp *Test.* 3,56

21:5(4) ὅτι ἀλλ' ἢ] > ὅτι *a* ⁻⁵²⁷ 44-74-107-125-610 Or; εἰ μή *L* 554^{mg}; *nisi* Cyp *Test.* 3,32

7 Origen

7.1 Prolegomena

The main problem in using Origen's (Or, 185–253 CE) quotations as a proto-Lucianic witness is that there is no certainty of whether Origen quotes his own revised text or the text as received by him. Rahlfs divided Origen's quotations from Kings into Hexaplaric and non-Hexaplaric. His analysis shows that Origen and *L* have common readings only when *L* and B also share the same reading. In the special readings of *L*, however, Origen stays with B or goes its own way.¹ For 1 Samuel, Brock too divides Origen's works into those containing a revised and those containing an unrevised LXX text.² Regarding the affinities of Origen's quotations and *L*, Brock seems to arrive at a twofold conclusion. On the one hand he accepts *L* as "one of the best witnesses to the fifth column,"³ yet he maintains that the agreements between Origen and *L* in readings that are not approximations to the Hebrew are pre-Lucianic.⁴ However, the most reasonable explanation for the agreements between Origen's quotations with a revised text and *L* is Hexaplaric influence in *L* (or Lucianic influence in manuscripts of Origen's work). Such agreements can hardly be demonstrated to be proto-Lucianic. By contrast, quotations in a work with an *unrevised* text may contain proto-Lucianic agreements between Origen and *L*.

However, there is only one⁵ quotation in a work with an unrevised text: *Selecta in Psalmos* 33 (*Sel. Ps.*; PG 12:1068b) quoting 1 Sam 21:1–6 [2–7] (Achimelech gives holy bread to David). The authenticity of *Sel. Ps.* is disputed, and the Greek text is "perhaps more subject to redaction than any other Greek survival from Origen's corpus."⁶ The unrevised (non-Hexaplaric) nature

¹ Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien 1: Studien zu den Königsbücher*, 79–80. On Origen's principles of quotation, see *ibid.*, pp. 48–54.

² Brock, *Recensions*, 77.

³ Brock, *Recensions*, 150. For the importance that Brock lays on *L* as a Hexaplaric witness, cf. also pp. 117–18, where Brock criticizes Johnson for not making "the obvious inference that *L* preserves ... a hexaplaric reading lost in *O*" when a Hebraizing reading is found only in Origen's quotations and *L*.

⁴ "[T]he quotations with revised text present a quite considerable number of variants supported by other text types, in particular a stratum found in *L*. -- A remarkable feature of Origen's variants of the (y) type [i.e. variants other than approximations, cf. p. 80] ... is the large number which agree with *L*. -- [T]hese particular variants in *L* are pre-Lucian." Brock, *Recensions*, 119–20.

⁵ The short reference to 21:5(4) in Fr. 1 Cor. 34 (Εἰ καθαρὰ τὰ παιδάκια ἀπὸ γυναικός) is excluded.

⁶ M.J. Edwards, review of P. Tzamalikos, *Origen: Philosophy of history and eschatology*, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 59 (2008): 520–1. For a brief introduction to problems concerning the authenticity of Origen's Psalm commentaries, see especially E. Mühlenberg, "Zur Überlieferung des Psalmenkommentars von Origenes", in J. Dummer (ed.), *Texte und Textkritik: Eine Aufsatzsammlung* (TU 133; Berlin, 1987), 441–2, and M.-J. Rondeau, "Le commentaire sur les Psaumes d'Evagre le Pontique", *OCP* 26 (1960), 307.

of the quotation is obvious: the only Hebraizing phenomena are the constant spelling of the priest's name as Ἀχιμέλεχ and perhaps the word order σήμερον ἁγιασθήσεται in verse 5.⁷

7.2 Analysis (*Selecta in Psalmos* 33 = 1 Sam 21:1–6)

First an excerpt from Origen's text is given with the relevant readings underlined. That is followed by some words of context from the BHS and Rahlfs and the apparatus for the readings to be discussed.

Sel. Ps. 33 Ἔχει δ' οὖν ἡ ἱστορία οὕτως· «Καὶ ἔρχεται Δαυῖδ εἰς Νομμᾶν πρὸς Ἀχιμέλεχ τὸν ἱερέα, καὶ ἐξέστη Ἀχιμέλεχ τῇ ἀπαντήσῃ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Τί ὅτι σὺ μόνος, καὶ οὐδεὶς μετὰ σοῦ; Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Δαυῖδ· ... Καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Ἀχιμέλεχ ὁ ἱερεὺς τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως, ... »

21:2(1) תְּלִמְיָחָא ... תְּלִמְיָחָא אַבִּימֶלֶח ... אַבִּימֶלֶח

אַבִּימֶלֶח 1^o B O 46^c-52-98(vid)-379 b d ^{-120.134} f 29 55 71 244] Ἀχιμέλεχ (αχει- 93-127) V L C', ^{-46c.52.98'} a s 120-134 245 460 554 707 Or *Sel. Ps.* 33; αχιμ (!) 158; αμιμελεχ A
 Αβιμελεχ 2^o O 46^c-52-98-379 b d ^{-120.134} f 29 55 71 244] αβειμελεχ B; Ἀχιμέλεχ (αχει- 93-127) V L C', ^{-46c.52.98'} a s ^{-92*} 120-134 158 245 460 554 707 Or *Sel. Ps.* 33; > 92*

21:3(2) תְּלִמְיָחָא תְּלִמְיָחָא תְּלִמְיָחָא תִּתְּ רָמָאִי καὶ εἶπεν Δαυιδ τῷ ἱερεῖ

τῷ ἱερεῖ] pr τω αβιμελεχ A 74; pr τω αχιμελεχ 120-134 554 = MT; αὐτῷ (et Δαυιδ tr) Or *Sel. Ps.* 33; > O 106-125 381 71; + αβιμελεχ 82; + αχιμελεχ (αχει- 93-127) L ⁻⁸²

21:7(6) תְּלִמְיָחָא אַבִּימֶלֶח ὁ ἱερεὺς

21:7(6) Αβιμελεχ (-λεκ 509) A O 46^c-52-98'-731^c b d ^{-120.125.134} f 29 55 71 244] αβειμελεχ B; Ἀχιμέλεχ (αχει- 127) V L C', ^{-46c.52.98'.731c} a s 120-134 158 245 460 554 707 Or *Sel. Ps.* 33; > 125

The reading Ἀχιμέλεχ of L and the majority corresponds to תְּלִמְיָחָא in the MT. The title of the Psalm Origen is commenting (34 in the MT) gives the name of the priest as Abimelech (LXX: Αβιμελεχ] αχιμελεχ U''-1221) but the words תְּלִמְיָחָא תְּלִמְיָחָא תְּלִמְיָחָא תִּתְּ רָמָאִי (Ps 34:1) no doubt refer to the

⁷ The omission of μου after the word σκεύη (v. 5) can, of course, originate from spelling the Hebrew word for 'vessel' without the suffix as in the MT: תְּלִיָּבָה. The article before the infinitive παρατεθῆναι in verse 6, however, is probably a purely inner-Greek addition.

incident with Achish (1 Sam 21:10–15).⁸ According to Origen’s commentary, the correct form of the name is Ἀχιμέλεχ and Ἀβιμέλεχ is a transcriptional error through interchange of *kāp* and *bēt* supposing that Ἀχιμέλεχ is a transcription of *kymlk*:

‘Ο τριακοστὸς τρίτος ψαλμὸς ἐπιγεγραμμένος, «τῷ Δαυΐδ, ὅποτε ἡλλοίωσε τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐναντίον Ἀβιμέλεχ,» ἔοικε τὸν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν Βασιλειῶν Ἀχιμέλεχ ὠνομασμένον Ἀβιμέλεχ ἀποκαλεῖν τῶν στοιχείων παρ’ Ἑβραίοις, λέγω δὲ τοῦ χάφ καὶ τοῦ βήθ, πολλὴν ὁμοιότητα σωζόντων, ὡς κατὰ μηδὲν ἀλλήλων διαλλάττειν, ἢ βραχεῖα κεραία μόνῃ.

The incorrect name in the title is perhaps the reason why Origen connects the Psalm with David’s visit to Nob. Brock observes that Origen does not seem to know of any LXX reading Ἀβιμελεχ, although in his allusion to the same passage in *Fr. 1 Cor.* 34 he himself gives the name as Ἀβιάθαρ⁹ ἢ Ἀβιμέλεχ. Brock assumes that Ἀχιμέλεχ is actually the original reading, Ἀβιμελεχ being an early corruption influenced by the Psalm title in question.¹⁰ If this is correct it also explains the agreement between Origen and *L*.

Sel. Ps. 33 Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Δαυΐδ· Ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐντέταλταί μοι σήμερον ῥῆμα, καὶ εἶπέ μοι· Μὴ γνῶτω μηδεὶς τὸ ῥῆμα περὶ οὗ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε, καὶ περὶ οὗ ἐγὼ ἐντέταλμαί σοι.

21:3(2) קְהִלָּה רַשָּׁה קְהִלָּה רַשָּׁה רַב־קְהִלָּה תִּשָּׁא τὸ ῥῆμα περὶ οὗ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε καὶ ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐντέταλμαί σοι

ὑπέρ] ὅπερ *d*^{-68.74.125}; περί *L* 554 Or *Sel. Ps.* 33

The verb ἐντέλλομαι does not demand either of the prepositions (ὑπέρ or περί), but both are adequate for the meaning “with which I have charged you” (NRSV) or “about the order which I have given you” (NJB). The reading of Origen and *L* 554 is most probably conformation to the preceding περί. This may well be Origen’s own adaptation without connection to *L*.

Sel. Ps. 33 Καὶ νῦν εἰ εἰσὶν ὑπὸ τὴν χειρὰ σου πέντε ἄρτοι, δὸς εἰς χειρὰ μου τὸ εὐρεθέν. Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, καὶ εἶπεν· Οὐκ εἰσὶν ἄρτοι βέβηλοι ὑπὸ τὴν χειρὰ μου, ἀλλ’ ἢ ἄρτοι ἅγιοι· εἰ ἐστὶ τὰ παιδάρια πεφυλαγμένα ἀπὸ γυναικὸς, καὶ φάγεται.

⁸ See, e.g., M. Dahood, *Psalms I* (AB 16; New Haven, 1965/2006), 205: “[M]any commentators consider [Abimelech] an historical inaccuracy ... but it is quite possible that Abimelech was the Semitic name of the king of Gath.”

⁹ The priest is supposed to have been Abiathar in Mark 2:26. Interestingly, Ἀβιάθαρ is not found in the LXX variants, nor Ἀβιμέλεχ or Ἀχιμέλεχ as a variant for Ἀβιάθαρ in Mark.

¹⁰ Brock, *Recensions*, 113–14.

21:5(4) וְיִשְׁרָאֵל הָאֱלֹהִים אֲלֵי אֲרָמוֹת אֱלֹהִים

ὅτι ἀλλ' ἤ] > ὅτι *a*⁻⁵²⁷ 44-74-107-125-610 Or *Sel. Ps.* 33; εἰ μή *L* 554^{mg}; *nisi Cyp Test.* 3,32

The expression ὅτι ἀλλ' ἤ is clearly a Semitism. It is found 18 times in the LXX and outside that only in quotations from the LXX. The expression is certainly used in (at least) two different senses: 'on the contrary' and 'except'. In all the 16 occurrences in Sam–Chr, at least one MS alters the expression – most often drop out the word ὅτι. If ὅτι ἀλλ' ἤ is accepted as original, the other readings display the tendency observed in all the occurrences of the phrase to simplify the expression somewhat.¹¹

21:5(4) וְיִשְׁרָאֵל הָאֱלֹהִים אֲלֵי אֲרָמוֹת אֱלֹהִים εἰ πεφυλαγμένα τὰ παιδάριά ἐστιν ἀπὸ γυναικός

εἰ πεφυλαγμένα τὰ παιδάριά ἐστιν] εἰ ἐστὶ τὰ παιδάρια πεφυλαγμένα *L* Syr¹ Or *Sel. Ps.* 33

It seems that Origen and *L* change the word order to the more usual one: verb first and the attribute after “lads” (NETS). The agreement between Origen and *L* is not striking.

Sel. Ps. 33 Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Δαυΐδ τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἀπεσχήμεθα χθὲς καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν. Ἐν τῷ ἐξελθεῖν με εἰς ὁδόν, γέγονε πάντα παιδάρια ἡγνισμένα. Καὶ αὕτη ἡ ὁδὸς βέβηλος, διότι σήμερον ἁγιασθήσεται διὰ τὰ σκεύη.

21:6(5) וְיִשְׁרָאֵל הָאֱלֹהִים אֲלֵי אֲרָמוֹת אֱלֹהִים διότι ἁγιασθήσεται σήμερον διὰ τὰ σκεύη μου

ἁγιασθήσεται σήμερον] tr 247 *L d*⁻¹²⁵ 554 Or *Sel. Ps.* 33 (*Fr. I Reg.* 10 [p. 298]¹²) *Tht I Reg.* 576 *Schol.* 45 46 = MT

The word order of the majority is the more natural one: since the emphasis is not on the time, it is convenient to have σήμερον after the verb. It is not

¹¹ This variation unit is treated at more length on p. 116.

¹² *Fragmenta in librum primum Regnorum* (GCS 6:295–303). The quotations in this work are very concise:

Σήμερον ἁγιασθήσεται διὰ τὰ σκεύη ἀσαφέστερον μὲν εἶπε, σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο. τὰ μὲν παιδία μου ἡγιάσται καὶ ἀπέσχηται γυναικὸς καὶ χθὲς καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν· τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ φάναι αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ παιδία ἡγνισμένα. εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἦν, πάντως ἡγιάζετο διὰ τοῦ φαγεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῆς προθέσεως. πεισθεὶς ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῖς εἰρημένοις δίδωσι τῷ Δαβὶδ τῶν ἄρτων, οὓς οὐκ ἔχρην ἐτέρους φαγεῖν ἢ μόνους τοὺς ἱερέας. (*Fr. I Reg.* 10)

unusual for the translator of 1 Samuel to depart from the Hebrew word order.¹³ There can hardly be any other reason for the reversed word order in Origen and *L* than a Hebraizing approximation.

Sel. Ps. 33 Καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Ἀχιμέλεχ ὁ ἱερεὺς τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως, ὅτι οὐκ ἦν ἄρτος ἐκεῖ, ἀλλ' ἢ οἱ ἄρτοι τοῦ προσώπου οἱ ἀφηρημένοι ἐκ προσώπου Κυρίου τοῦ παρατεθῆναι ἄρτον θερμὸν, ἧ ἡμέρα ἔλαβεν αὐτούς.

21:7(6) בִּי-אִם-לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים שֶׁם לֶחֶם בִּי לֹא-הָיָה ὅτι οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄρτος ὅτι ἀλλ' ἢ ἄρτοι
τοῦ προσώπου

ÖTİ 2°] om *L* 328 *b* 44-107-610 56 381 554 Or *Sel. Ps.* 33

This case is comparable to 21:5 above (ὅτι ἀλλ' ἦ] > ὅτι *a* ⁻⁵²⁷ 44-74-107-125-610 Or *Sel. Ps.* 33; εἰ μὴ *L* 554), but here *L* does not change the expression to εἰ μὴ but simply omits ὅτι. Since Origen does not tolerate ὅτι ἀλλ' ἦ in the first instance, it is natural that he simplifies the expression here also; ἀλλ' ἦ is frequent in Origen's texts whereas ὅτι ἀλλ' ἦ is not found at all.

To conclude, Origen does not seem to preserve any proto-Lucianic readings. The agreements between Origen and *L* are easily explained as subtle stylization (21:3, 5, 7) or approximations to the Hebrew (Ἀχιμέλεχ, 21:6). In *L* the latter type of readings are probably Hexaplaric and in Origen's text they are influenced by his knowledge of Hebrew.

¹³ Examples of this will easily be found by anyone comparing the Hebrew and Greek texts of 1 Samuel. An analogous instance is found in 14:30: **הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** ὁ λαὸς σήμερον] σήμερον ὁ λαός A O d⁻⁷⁴ 554.

8 The Old Latin Version

8.1 Prolegomena

Of all the witnesses for the LXX text that may contain proto-Lucianic readings, the testimony of the Old Latin version(s) (OL) is most controversial and difficult to evaluate. Parts of this OL version may have been preserved in three sources: 1. OL MSS, 2. OL marginal readings in Vulgate MSS, and 3. such quotations of Latin church fathers that were not translated by the authors themselves or that do not follow (exclusively) the Vulgate.

1. Portions of the OL of 1 Samuel have been preserved mainly in two fragmentary fifth century MSS: La¹¹⁵ and La¹¹⁶ (Brooke-McLean: La^b and La^q). Although the MSS are some 100–200 years later than the supposed date of the Lucianic recension, the translation they attest may be considerably earlier. For want of a thoroughgoing study of the OL in the historical books, there cannot be certainty about whether these particular MSS are witnesses to a pre-Lucianic stage of the LXX.

Since for La¹¹⁵ there is a revised edition¹ and La¹¹⁶ is only a tiny fragment (containing 1 Sam 9:1–8; 15:10–18) it has seemed advisable for the purposes of the present study to limit the discussion to La¹¹⁵. According to the editors, “[t]he script is to be dated to the 5th century without a doubt and can be located in Africa with great probability.”² La¹¹⁵ contains text from the following verses in 1 Samuel: 1:14–2:15, 3:10–4:18, 6:3–17, 9:21–10:7, 10:16–11:13, 14:12–34, about 140 verses altogether.

La¹¹⁵ is one the witnesses used by Henry Voogd in his unpublished dissertation on the OL texts of 1 Samuel.³ While Voogd’s work is indispensable as a collection of material, he provides no analysis of the individual cases and his conclusions are often not more than statistical statements concerning the distribution of readings between different agreement patterns. For La¹¹⁵ the following figures can be deduced from Voogd’s lists of readings.

¹ B. Fischer/E. Ulrich/J.E. Sanderson, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis: A Revised Edition of L 115 for Samuel-Kings”, *BIOSCS* 16 (1983), 13–87. Voogd had at his disposal the edition by Johannes Belshem: *Palimpsestus vindobonensis: Antiquissimae Veteris testamenti translationis latinae fragmenta: E Commentariis theologicis (Theologisk Tidsskrift) separatim expressa* (Christianiae: 1885) (= Belshem).

² Fischer et al., “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis”, 30.

³ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”.

Table 1. Agreements between La¹¹⁵ and different LXX MS Traditions in 1 Sam according to Voogd

Pattern ⁴	Number of cases	Percentage of all cases
La ¹¹⁵ = B ≠ L	78	28%
La ¹¹⁵ = B ≠ A O	17	6%
La ¹¹⁵ = B ≠ A O L	23	8%
La ¹¹⁵ = A O ≠ B L	5	2%
La ¹¹⁵ = L ≠ B A O	70	25%
Unique readings of La ¹¹⁵	75	27%
La ¹¹⁵ = other MSS/Versions	11	4%

Voogd's conclusion on these figures is as follows:

In the readings of the L^b manuscript fragments the agreements of L^b with Luc against G are approximately equal in number to the agreements of L^b with G against Luc. It is very evident that both the Old Greek and Lucianic or Syrian text traditions are well represented.⁵

In his overall conclusions on the OL manuscripts (chapter III B), Voogd assesses the implications of this as follows:

Since the Old Latin manuscript readings contain Old Greek text tradition as well as the Antiochian or Syrian, it is highly probable that the text of the Old Latin manuscripts underwent revision in the course of time and this revision was effected in the direction of the Old Greek.⁶

Several problems arise: Why would this conclusion be more probable than to suppose that the mixture of textual traditions in OL manuscripts is due to revision of the OL according to a Greek Lucianic text? In principle the relation can go either way: The base text of the OL is proto-Lucianic and the B-readings in it are due to revision, or the base text is the B text and the L-readings are due to revision. In order to demonstrate revision to whichever direction, however, one should find several indisputable agreements between La¹¹⁵ and L in pure Lucianic recensional readings. If such agreements were numerous (like Voogd's 70, see Table 1 above) that would demonstrate beyond

⁴ Voogd uses the following sigla: L^b = La¹¹⁵ in Belsheim's edition; G = "The text of the Old Greek", more specifically "The Old Greek family", which corresponds to my B text; Luc = L; H = A O. Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", viii, x–xi, 2–3.

⁵ Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 178.

⁶ Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 195.

doubt that either a. the translation is later than 300 CE and, accordingly, La¹¹⁵ does not qualify as a pre-Lucianic witness, or b. the Latin translation has been revised against a Lucianic type of Greek text. However, if only a few agreements were found, it would be more reasonable to assume that only some sporadic intrusion of recensional Lucianic readings has taken place in the transmission of the translation. In order to address these problems, the agreements between La¹¹⁵ and *L* will be analyzed in section 8.2.

2. In five Vulgate MSS there are marginal readings in 1 Samuel that possibly reflect the OL. Four of these (La^{91.92.94.95}) are included in Ciriaca Morano Rodríguez's edition (La^M). The fifth, La⁹³ (Brook-McLean: La^V), is a deficient copy of La⁹¹ and is therefore not included in La^M.⁷ La⁹³, however, was the first of these that was noted by textual scholars. Its editor, C. Vercellone, posited that the marginal readings in it reflect a genuine OL translation.⁸ Voogd took quite a positive view on La⁹³: "it is the opinion of the writer that the marginal notes possess genuineness as Old Latin evidence."⁹ However, F. C. Burkitt questioned already in 1896 whether the readings in La⁹³ actually reflect the OL; they may as well have been taken and translated directly from some Greek sources.¹⁰ Ulrich accepts the marginal readings as a whole as "plausible evidence."¹¹ All in all, it is uncertain whether the marginal readings attest genuine proto-Lucianic readings or whether the agreements between them and *L* are late. In the next section La^M is occasionally cited to demonstrate that it often diverges from La¹¹⁵.

3. The third source of readings of the OL are the quotations of early Latin church fathers. There are only two Latin fathers that antedate Lucian and quote 1 Samuel: Tertullian and Cyprian.¹² For Tertullian, it seems that he both used existing translations and translated himself (see p. 82). His few agreements with OL witnesses are most likely coincidental. Bonifatius Fischer's study on the Lucianic readings in the OL has already been referred to in section 6.1. Fischer concluded that the *Vorlage* of the OL was of the proto-Lucianic type, but the translation has been corrected according to a Greek text of the B type.¹³ Fischer's conclusions should not, however, be applied to the question of the origins of the OL translation but only to the type of the Latin text that Cyprian used. Moreover, the validity of his conclusions for Cyprian's quotations from 1

⁷ C. Morano Rodríguez, *Glosas marginales de "vetus latina" en las biblias vulgatas españolas: 1–2 Samuel* (Textos y estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense 48. Madrid: Instituto de Filología C.S.I.C., 1989), xxvii, xxix. See also E.C. Ulrich, "The Old Latin Translation of the LXX and the Hebrew Scrolls from Qumran", in idem, *Dead Sea Scrolls* (original print in E. Tov [ed.], *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel* [Jerusalem: Academon, 1980], 121–65), 237.

⁸ C. Vercellone, *Variae Lectiones Vulgatae Latinae Bibliorum editionis*, vol. 2 (Rome, 1864). Quoted by Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 110–11.

⁹ Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 111.

¹⁰ F.C. Burkitt, *The Old Latin and the Itala* (TS 4,3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896), 9–10.

¹¹ Ulrich, "Old Latin Translation", 261.

¹² The Latin translation of Irenaeus' *Against Heresies* may be as early as the third century, but it seems fairly certain that its translator did not utilize any existing OL translation; see p. 53.

¹³ Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten", 169–71.

Samuel were called into question in chapter 6, where a case was made for just the opposite: that Cyprian's Greek text was essentially the B-text (see p. 107).

Concerning the OL evidence as a whole, Brock states that "it is generally agreed that from their very inception the Old Latin translations were under continuous influence of, and contamination from, Greek texts."¹⁴ According to him, that makes the OL an extremely hazardous witness for the proto-Lucianic text:

[W]hile it cannot be denied that the Old Latin fragments contain a large number of 'Lucianic' readings, these may be due to the work of later correctors using 'Lucianic' manuscripts... . [T]hese Old Latin fragments contain a considerable amount of hexaplaric material, which must have entered Lat [= OL] in this way, and so *a priori* there is no reason to suppose that this may not have been the case with the "Lucianic" readings too.¹⁵

8.2 Analysis (La¹¹⁵)

First it must be noted that La¹¹⁵ seems to mostly agree with the B text. Voogd lists 78 instances of agreement between La¹¹⁵ and B against L.¹⁶ These very clearly demonstrate that the translation witnessed by La¹¹⁵ cannot have been done on the basis of a wholly Lucianic Greek text. A couple of examples will suffice:

6:7 καὶ δύο βόας πρωτοτοκούσας ἄνευ τῶν τέκνων = *et duas uaccas primi partus sine uitulis suis* La¹¹⁵] + ἐφ' ἃς οὐκ ἐπετέθη ζυγός L 44-106-107-125-610 488 158 318 (cf. MT: לַעֲלֹאֲלֵהֶם לְעֹלֵהֶם לְעֹלֵהֶם לְעֹלֵהֶם)

11:4 καὶ ἔρχονται οἱ ἄγγελοι = *et uenerunt nuntii* La¹¹⁵] pr καὶ ἀπέστειλαν ἀγγέλους οἱ ἄνδρες Ἰαβὶς τῆς Γαλααδιτίδος L¹⁷

14:29 εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου / (ὅτι) ἐγευσάμην βραχὺ τοῦ μέλιτος τούτου = *uiderunt oculi mei quia gustavi modicum mellis huius* La¹¹⁵] tr. L 554^{mg}

In the following, Voogd's list of 70 "Agreements of L^b with Luc against G and H"¹⁸ is subjected to criticism. The textual evidence will be presented as follows: After the verse number from 1 Samuel, Rahlfs' text is given together with the corresponding text of La¹¹⁵. The readings of the LXX MSS are given in an apparatus. Often the analysis is based on observations of the tendencies in La¹¹⁵ in 1 Samuel – a full-scale study of the phenomena in all the extant parts of the manuscript would have been beyond the scope of the present study.

¹⁴ Brock, *Recensions*, 217. Differently Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, 233.

¹⁵ Brock, *Recensions*, 217.

¹⁶ Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 155–60.

¹⁷ Brock, *Recensions*, 252, lists the instance under the qualification "Longer, rather pedantic, additions."

¹⁸ Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 165–71.

8.2.1 Reading has Changed from Belsheim to Fischer et al.

There are a good number of differences between the editions of Belsheim and Fischer et al. The MS is a palimpsest and at Belsheim's time many of the readings that can now be deciphered by ultraviolet light remained unclear.¹⁹ In the following six instances the change of reading from Belsheim to the new edition has removed the agreement between La¹¹⁵ and *L* (in most cases only the lemmas are given):

6:14 ἔστησαν *steterunt* La¹¹⁵] ἔστη *L*;²⁰ *stetit* Belsheim

9:27 καὶ Σαμουήλ εἶπεν *samuel dixit* La¹¹⁵] εἶπεν Σαμουήλ *L*; *et dixit samuel* Belsheim

10:1 καὶ τοῦτό σοι τὸ σημεῖον *et hoc erit tibi signum*

καὶ *et* La¹¹⁵] = *L*; > Belsheim²¹

11:2 ὄνειδος *inproperium* La¹¹⁵] *pr* εἰς *L* 554; *in obproprium* Belsheim

11:11 ἔθετο Σαουλ τὸν λαὸν εἰς τρεῖς ἀρχάς *disposuit*²² *saul populum tribus agminibus*

ἔθετο] διέθετο *V C'* 799 29 55 71 244 554^{mg}; διέταξε *L* 318 554^{txt}; *disposuit* La¹¹⁵; *constituit* Belsheim

Cf. 9:22 καὶ ἔθετο αὐτοῖς τόπον *et constituit illis locum*

ἔθετο] ἔταξεν *L* 554^{mg} 23; *constituit* La¹¹⁵

In La¹¹⁵ the verbs containing the root τίθημι are constantly rendered with an expression containing the verbal stem *pono*. (See a fuller treatment of this phenomenon below under 9:22.) Relying on that observation it is safe to assume that La¹¹⁵ follows either the reading ἔθετο or διέθετο.

14:31 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ *in illa die*

¹⁹ Fischer explains this in the introduction of the edition: Fischer et al., “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis”, 15, 18.

²⁰ The singular in *L* is a recensional conformation to the singular subject (ἡ ἄμαξα) – there is no need to suppose contact with the reading תָּבַחַתִּי of the MT.

²¹ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 168, erroneously cites *L* as omitting the word καί. There is probably some mix-up with v. 2 since Voogd actually refers to the instance as “10:2.” V. 2 does not, however, contain the word τοῦτο/hoc.

²² Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 170: *constituit* = Belsheim.

²³ In MS 554 the reading is – in all probability erroneously – indicated as a variant for the word εἰσήγαγεν.

ἐκείνη *illa* La¹¹⁵] ταύτη *L* 318 554; *hoc* Belsheim

In the following three instances the change of reading has revealed an agreement between La¹¹⁵ and *L*:

4:7 οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι *alienigenae* Belsheim] πρ. σφόδρα *V s*^{-64'}; pr. *ualde* La¹¹⁵;
+ σφόδρα *L* 799

10:19 τὰς φυλάς *familias* Belsheim] χιλιάδας φυλῶν 509; χιλιάδας *A O L CII*
119^c *d*^{-68'} *s*^{-92.488} 244 460 554; *milia* La¹¹⁵

14:32 καὶ ἐκλίθη ὁ λαὸς εἰς τὰ σκῦλα *e[t im]petum fecit populus in predam*

ἐκλίθη *conspectum erat* Belsheim] ὥρμησεν *L d* 318 554^c; *[im]petum fecit*
La¹¹⁵

8.2.2 Apparent or Coincidental Agreements between La¹¹⁵ and *L*

In the following 27 cases the agreement pattern is not at all clear. Most of these classify as *apparent* or *coincidental* agreements (see p. 23). While in some instances La¹¹⁵ might well be dependent on the *L*-reading, for text-historical conclusions it is best to disregard these instances.

1:17 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ *et dixit ad illam*

αὐτῇ] πρὸς αὐτήν *L CII a d*⁻¹²⁵ 55 71 318 554; *ad illam* La¹¹⁵

La¹¹⁵ seems to follow the *L*-reading πρὸς αὐτήν, but this may well be coincidental. In La¹¹⁵ there does not seem to be a pattern in how the verbs of saying are construed in connection with personal pronouns. There are instances of *ad* + acc. for both the Greek dative (1:14, 23 εἶπεν αὐτῇ [*dixit*] *ad eam*) and for πρὸς + acc. (9:21 ἐλάλησας πρὸς ἐμέ *locutus es ad me*) as well as the Latin dative for the Greek dative (10:1 εἶπεν αὐτῷ *dixit ei*, 10:2 ἐροῦσίν σοι *dicent tibi*, 11:3 λέγουσιν αὐτῷ *dixerunt ei*).²⁴ The *ad* + acc. construction may have been chosen by the Latin translator to bring up the femininity of the one spoken to – the dative of the personal and demonstrative pronouns is the same for all genders.

1:19 προσκυνοῦσιν] προσεκύνησαν *L*; *adorauerunt* La¹¹⁵

²⁴ No variant readings in these cases, except om αὐτῷ 125 in 10:1.

Cf. 1:19 ὀρθρίζουσιν] ὀρθρίσαντες *L* 318; *surrexerunt* La¹¹⁵
πορεύονται] ἐπορεύθησαν *O L*; *abierunt* La¹¹⁵ (these two are not
included in Voogd's list)

4:4 αἵρουσιν] ἦραν M^{mg} *L*; *tulerunt*²⁵ La¹¹⁵

6:14 σχίζουσιν] ἔσχισαν *L*; *consciderunt*²⁶ La¹¹⁵

10:21 προσάγει ... προσάγουσιν] προσήγαγε ... προσήγαγε *L* 554^{mg}; *accessit* ...
adduxit La¹¹⁵

10:23 λαμβάνει] ἔλαβεν *L*; *accepit* La¹¹⁵

11:4 λαλοῦσιν] λέγουσιν 74; ἐλάλησαν *L* 460; *et locuti sunt* La¹¹⁵

11:9 ἀπαγγέλλουσιν] ἀνήγγειλαν *L* ⁽⁻¹⁹⁾; *et renuntiauerunt* La¹¹⁵

According to Brock, removal of the historic present is one of the linguistic characteristics of *L*.²⁷ The avoidance of the historic present in La¹¹⁵, however, may be just the convention of the translator.²⁸

1:24 [25 LXX] καὶ προσήγαγον ἐνώπιον κυρίου *et adduxerunt eum in conspectu dñi*

προσήγαγον] + αὐτόν *L d* ⁻⁶⁸; + *eum* La¹¹⁵

Generally La¹¹⁵ is very faithful in rendering the pronouns of its Greek *Vorlage*. In this case, however, some doubt remains: In Greek the verb προσάγω can be either transitive or intransitive. If an object is not explicated the meaning of προσήγαγον can be either “they approached” or “they brought him” (NETS). In Latin, however, the verb *adduco* is transitive and this compels the Latin translator to add the pronoun *eum*.

2:12 καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἡλὶ τοῦ ἱερέως υἱοὶ λοιμοὶ οὐκ εἰδότες τὸν κύριον *et filii heli erant fili pestilentiae et nescientes dñm*

οὐκ = MT] pr καὶ *L Ast Ps* 25,6 *Chr Joann* 1,2; pr *et* La¹¹⁵

Although the Lucianic recensor is prone to remove unnecessary conjunctions,²⁹ he also now and then adds conjunctions. The translation in La¹¹⁵ gives

²⁵ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 167: *sustulerunt* = Belsheim.

²⁶ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 167: *consciderunt* = Belsheim.

²⁷ Brock, *Recensions*, 251.

²⁸ Cf. the statement by the editors: “the Latin translator almost never uses the historical present.” Fischer et al., “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis”, 44.

the general impression of following the conjunctions of its Greek *Vorlage* quite faithfully. Here, however, the conjunction *et* clearly improves the readability of the text and can thus be attributed to the translator or a copyist.

2:14 πάν ὁ ἐὰν ἀνέβη omne quodcumq· ascendebat

ἀνέβη] ἀναβῆ V 509 29; ἀνέβαινε L

On the whole, the translation in La¹¹⁵ is very faithful in rendering the Greek imperfect with the Latin imperfect, but some ambiguity remains. See the fuller treatment of this question below under 2:14 ἐπάταξεν.

3:18 τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ποιήσει quod placuerit in conspectu suo faciet

τὸ ἀγαθόν] τὸ ἀρεστόν L 509 f 554^c; quod placuerit La¹¹⁵

Cf. 1:23 ποίει τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου fac quod bonum est in conspectu tuo

τὸ ἀγαθόν] τὸ ἀρεστόν L d⁻⁶⁸ 554; quod bonum est La¹¹⁵ 30

Cf. 11:10 ποιήσετε ἡμῖν τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν facietis nobis omnem bonum cora\ uobis

τὸ ἀγαθόν] τὸ ἀρεστόν L^{-108mg}; omnem bonum La¹¹⁵

The reading *quod placuerit* in La¹¹⁵ exhibits the occasional freedom of translation and may reflect either Greek reading (ἀγαθόν or ἀρεστόν).³¹ It also remains uncertain whether the word ἀγαθόν or ἀρεστόν is attested by La¹¹⁵ in vv. 1:23 and 11:10.

3:21 ἐπιστεύθη Σαμουηλ προφήτης γενέσθαι creditum est samuel factum esse³² profetam

προφήτης γενέσθαι] τοῦ (> M V CI 29 55 71 158) γενέσθαι εἰς (> M V CI 29 71 158) προφήτην M V L CI s 29 55 71 158 244 245 318 460 554^c; factum esse profetam La¹¹⁵

While the word order in La¹¹⁵ may reflect the word order in the *L*-reading, generally one should not argue anything about the Greek word order on the

²⁹ Brock, *Recensions*, 252–3.

³⁰ The instance is included in Voogd's list "Agreements of L^b with G against Luc." "Critical and Comparative Study", 155.

³¹ See Brock's list of lexical variants in *L*: Brock, *Recensions*, 265.

³² Voogd, "Critical and Comparative Study", 166: *est* = Belsheim.

basis of the word order in a Latin translation.³³ That the word ‘prophet’ is in the accusative (as in *L* etc.) is due to the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction.

6:3 ἀποδιδόντες ἀπόδοτε αὐτῇ τῆς βασάνου καὶ τότε ἰαθήσεσθε [...] *Pro tormento donum et tunc sani eritis*

τῆς βασάνου] pr ὑπέρ *L* 44-106-107-125-610 158 318 554^{mg}; + δῶρα *L* 44-106-107-125-610 158 554^{mg}; *pro tormento donum* La¹¹⁵

6:8 τῆς βασάνου] pr ὑπέρ *L* 106 158 318; *pro tormento* La¹¹⁵

6:17 τῆς βασάνου] pr ὑπέρ *L* 44-106-107-125-610 158 318 554; *pro tormento donū* La¹¹⁵

Cf. 6:4 (not cited by Voogd) τί τὸ τῆς βασάνου ἀποδώσομεν αὐτῇ *quid pro tormento plagae huius*³⁴ *reddemus ei*

τῆς βασάνου] pr ὑπέρ *L* 44-106-107-125-610 318; + ἀπόδομα *O*; *pro tormento plagae huius* La¹¹⁵

These four cases are best dealt with together. The Latin translator could scarcely have left the word *tormentum* without any preposition – a simple genitive as in Greek was not an option. Therefore it remains uncertain whether La¹¹⁵ attests a Greek text with the preposition ὑπέρ (*L* and its companions) or not. In 6:17 the word *donum* in La¹¹⁵ without any Greek counterpart is probably just an echo from v. 6:3.

6:9 αὐτὸς πεποίηκεν ἡμῖν τὴν κακίαν ταύτην ... οὐ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἥπται ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ σύμπτωμα τοῦτο γέγονεν ἡμῖν *ipse enim fecit uobis mala haec ... non manus eius tetigit nos set [!] casus contigit nobis*

ἡμῖν 1° = MT] ὑμῖν *L*⁻¹⁰⁸ CII 119 44 s^{-(92.)488} La¹¹⁵
ἡμῖν 2° = MT La¹¹⁵] ὑμῖν 242’

The priests and the diviners of the Philistines give their advice about the ark mainly in the second person (underlined; first person in bold):

(3) καὶ εἶπαν Εἰ ἐξαπεστέλλετε ὑμεῖς τὴν κιβωτὸν διαθήκης κυρίου θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, μὴ δὴ ἐξαποστείλητε αὐτὴν κενὴν, ἀλλὰ ἀποδιδόντες ἀπόδοτε αὐτῇ τῆς βασάνου, καὶ τότε ἰαθήσεσθε, καὶ ἐξιλασθήσεται ὑμῖν, μὴ οὐκ ἀποστῇ ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἀφ’ ὑμῶν. (4) ... Κατ’ ἀριθμὸν τῶν σατραπῶν τῶν ἁλλοφύλων πέντε ἔδρας χρυσᾶς, ὅτι πταῖσμα ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ὑμῶν καὶ τῷ λαῷ, (5) καὶ μὴ χρυσοῦς ὁμοίωμα τῶν μυῶν ὑμῶν τῶν διαφθειρόντων τὴν γῆν· καὶ δώσετε τῷ κυρίῳ δόξαν, ὅπως κουφίσῃ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἀφ’

³³ Fischer, “Limitations”, 369.

³⁴ For *plagae huius* Belsheim reads: *itaq’ae (!) hi/hoc*. Fischer et al., “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis”, 48, suggest that *plagae huius* is a doublet for (ὑπέρ) τῆς βασάνου.

ὕμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν ὕμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ὕμῶν. (6) καὶ ἵνα τί βαρύνετε τὰς καρδίας ὕμῶν, ... (7) καὶ νῦν λάβετε καὶ ποιήσατε ἅμαξαν καινὴν καὶ δύο βόας πρωτοτοκούσας ἄνευ τῶν τέκνων καὶ ζεύξατε τὰς βόας ἐν τῇ ἀμάξῃ καὶ ἀπαγάγετε τὰ τέκνα ἀπὸ ὅπισθεν αὐτῶν εἰς οἶκον· (8) καὶ λήμψεσθε τὴν κιβωτὸν καὶ θήσετε αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὴν ἅμαξαν καὶ τὰ σκεύη τὰ χρυσᾶ ἀποδώσετε αὐτῇ τῆς βασάνου καὶ θήσετε ἐν θέματι βερσεχθαν ἐκ μέρους αὐτῆς καὶ ἐξαποστελεῖτε αὐτήν καὶ ἀπελάσατε αὐτήν, καὶ ἀπελεύσεται· (9) καὶ ὄψεσθε εἰ εἰς ὁδὸν ὁρίων αὐτῆς πορεύσεται κατὰ Βαιθσαμυς, αὐτὸς πεποίηκεν ἡμῖν τὴν κακίαν ταύτην τὴν μεγάλην, καὶ ἐὰν μή, καὶ γνωσόμεθα ὅτι οὐ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἦται ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ σύμπτωμα τοῦτο γέγονεν ἡμῖν. (1 Sam 6:3–9)

Often the itacism has caused confusion between the first and second person plural personal pronouns in some MSS,³⁵ but both *L* and *La*¹¹⁵ attest the second person through vv. 3–8. A natural reason for the second person in *L* in v. 9 is that the Lucianic recensor thought that the narrative should go on in the second person until the first person verb γνωσόμεθα. The same reasoning probably explains the second person in *CII* 119 44 *s*^{-(92.)488} and *La*¹¹⁵ as well – they are not necessarily dependent on the *L*-reading. Moreover, in Latin a transcriptional error may cause variation between the forms NOBIS and VOBIS.

6:9 καὶ ἐὰν μή καὶ γνωσόμεθα *et si non abierint sciemus*³⁶
καὶ 2^o = MT] > *O L* 509 44-125 460

While a minor detail, *La*¹¹⁵ seems to follow the conjunction patterns of its base text very strictly. Considering this, it seems quite safe to suppose that *La*¹¹⁵ indeed attests here a Greek reading without καί. The conjunction is redundant in both Greek and Latin and for that reason it is left out by the Lucianic recensor (and probably independently in the other MSS)³⁷ and the translator/copyist of *La*¹¹⁵.

6:16 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ] *pr* ἐν *O L* 242' 134 *s*⁻⁹² 245; > 125; *in illa die* *La*¹¹⁵

Cf. 4:1 ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις *in diebus illis*

Cf. 6:15 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ *in illa die* *La*¹¹⁵] > □*v* 509 488

Cf. 14:18 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ *in illa die*

Cf. 14:23 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ *in illo die*, 24 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ *in illa die*, 31 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ *in illa die*

³⁵ E.g., 6:3 ὕμεῖς] ἡμεῖς 376* 98* 158^c; ἡμῖν 158*; ὕμῖν] ἡμῖν 376 *CI* 246 158 460; ὕμῶν] ἡμῶν 247 93 488-489* 460 707; ὕμᾶς 158.

³⁶ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 167: *scientes* = Belsheim.

³⁷ Brock, *Recensions*, 252 includes the instance in his examples of the “removal in *L* of the redundant (in Greek) καί introducing an apodosis.”

Since in all the extant instances of the expression “on that day” / “in those days” La¹¹⁵ attests a preposition, the agreement with *L* and several other MSS in 6:16 is most likely coincidental.

10:2 ἐν τῷ ὁρίῳ Βενιαμιν *in finibus beniamin*

τῷ ὁρίῳ 71 158 245 318] τοῖς (> 127) ὁρίοις *L f*; τῷ ὄρει *rel*; *in finibus* La¹¹⁵; *in monte* La^M; מִן הַבְּנֵי־מִנְיָן MT

Tov includes this instance in the category “*boc₂e₂* reflect the OG from which the corrupt text form of the other MSS has developed.”³⁸ Rahlfs’ solution, however, seems correct: the reading τῷ ὁρίῳ (71 158 245 318) explains well the existence of the other readings. The word ὄριον ‘boundary, limit’ is used mainly in the plural which suggests that the plural form in *L* is recensional. The reading τῷ ὄρει “(on) the mountain” results from a transcriptional error. Accordingly, by attesting the word ‘boundary’ La¹¹⁵ follows the original reading. The plural form *finibus*, however, results from normal Latin usage: *finis* in the sense ‘borders; territory, land, country’ is always used in the plural.

10:17 καὶ παρήγγειλεν Σαμουηλ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ *et precepit samuel omni populo conuenire*

παντὶ τῷ λαῷ] πάντα τὸν λαόν *L* 119^c *s*^{-64.92} 158; + ἐλθεῖν 247; + συναχθῆναι 318; *omni populo conuenire* La¹¹⁵

While included in Voogd’s list “Agreements of L^b with Luc against G and H,”³⁹ the agreement is only between 318 and La¹¹⁵ in adding the word “to gather.” Even this might be coincidental: since παραγγέλλω may mean specifically ‘summon to appear’ (LSJ) – as in this instance (Muraoka: “*to order to present oneself* at a certain place, ... 1K 10.17”) – the Latin translator may have chosen to use two verbs (*precepit ... conuenire*) for the rendering.

10:22 εἰ ἔρχεται ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐνταῦθα ... αὐτὸς κέκρυπται ἐν τοῖς σκεύεσιν *an uenturus esset illo saul ... absconsus est hic inter uasa*

αὐτὸς (>19) κέκρυπται] + ἐνθάδε *L* 554^{mg}; + ἐνταῦθα *V*; *absconsus est hic* La¹¹⁵

The Latin word *hic* can be either the demonstrative pronoun that corresponds to the Greek word αὐτός, or the adverb ‘here’ that corresponds to the plus ἐνθάδε or ἐνταῦθα. The editors of La¹¹⁵ suggest that *hic* “probably reflects

³⁸ Tov, “Lucian”, 111.

³⁹ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 168.

ενθαδε rather than αὐτος”⁴⁰ despite the fact that the preceding word ἐνταῦθα is rendered with *illo* ‘to that place, thither.’ The case remains uncertain.

11:10 τὸ ἀγαθόν] pr. πᾶν *L*⁻¹⁹; *omnem bonum* La¹¹⁵; לְכֹל MT

The addition of πᾶν/*omnem* might be Hebraizing but it may also be simply a manner of speech.

11:12 παράδος τοὺς ἄνδρας *trade nobis homines*

ἄνδρας] ἀνῶς *L*; *homines* La¹¹⁵; אַנְשֵׁי MT

In La¹¹⁵ the word ἄνθρωπος is always rendered with the word *homo* (1:21; 4:13, 14, 18; 14:24, 28). The word ἀνὴρ, on the other hand, is mostly rendered with *vir* (1:18, 22, 23; 2:9; 4:2, 10, 15, 17; 6:15; 9:22; 10:2, 3, 6, 21; 11:1, 3, 7, 8 twice, 9 twice, 10; 14:20, 23) but *homo* is used occasionally as well: 4:2 ἀνδρῶν *hominum*, 4:16 ἀνὴρ *homo*, 9:21 ἀνδρός *homini*, 14:14 ἄνδρες *hominum* (no Greek variant readings in those cases).

14:13 καὶ ὁ αἶρων τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐτοῦ *et qui portabat arma eius post eum*

μετ’] ὀπίσω *L CII s*⁻⁴⁸⁹; *post* La¹¹⁵; אַחֲרָיו MT

The reading *post eum* in La¹¹⁵ does not presuppose a Greek reading ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ (*L CII s*⁻⁴⁸⁹): if the Latin translator misread the genitive αὐτοῦ as an accusative, the meaning changed from “with him” (μετ’ αὐτοῦ) to “behind him” (μετ’ αὐτόν), and was translated accordingly.

14:32 καὶ ἐκλίθη ὁ λαὸς εἰς τὰ σκῦλα καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ λαὸς ποίμνια ... καὶ ἔσφαξεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἤσθιεν ὁ λαὸς σὺν τῷ αἵματι *e[t im]petum fecit*⁴¹
populus in predam et accepit populus greges ... et occiderunt in terram et manducauit populus cum sanguine

ἔσφαξεν] ἔσφαξαν *CII d s* 29 244 460 554; ἔσφαζεν *CI*; ἔσφαζον *V L f* 55 245 318; *occiderunt* La¹¹⁵

The translation in La¹¹⁵ is quite faithful in rendering the Greek imperfect with the Latin imperfect (see below under 2:14 ἐπάταξεν). Accordingly, La¹¹⁵ only agrees with *V L CII d f s* 29 55 244 245 318 460 554 in the plural. “People” (λαὸς) is logically plural and this causes the change of the predicate

⁴⁰ Fischer et al., “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis”, 52.

⁴¹ For the words *e[t im]petum fecit* Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 160, reads: *et conspectrum erat* = Belsheim.

to plural. This happens easily in several textual traditions independently – and in Latin as easily as in Greek.

8.2.3 La¹¹⁵ Agrees with *L* in an Early Variant

In the following 16 cases the wide MS support for the reading attested by both La¹¹⁵ and *L* suggests that the reading is an early variant that has ended up in both the Greek *Vorlage* of La¹¹⁵ and the base text of the Lucianic recension.

1:20 καὶ εἶπεν] λέγουσα *L CI d*^{-68'} 29 318 554; *dicens* La¹¹⁵

The verbs εἶπεν and εἶπον/εἶπαν are always rendered by *dixit* and *dixerunt* in La¹¹⁵. The only exception is 10:25 (καὶ εἶπεν Σαμουηλ *et locutus est samuel*), which does not introduce direct speech. This makes it very likely that if the underlying Greek in 1:20 was καὶ εἶπεν, we would find *et dixit* in La¹¹⁵. This conclusion is enhanced by the observation that in La¹¹⁵ the present participles are very sparse; often a Greek present participle is rendered with a finite verb. The present participles are preserved mainly in introducing direct speech: 9:26; 10:2; 11:7; 14:28, 24 λέγων *dicens*; 14:33 λέγοντες *dicentes*.⁴² Accordingly, there is little doubt that La¹¹⁵ attests the reading in *L CI d*^{-68'} 29 318 554. To be sure, Brock includes the reading in his list of “Linguistic Characteristics of *L*” – “Participle to avoid parataxis” but with some hesitation.⁴³ The support from *CI* and 29 suggest that the participle may be an early variant rather than a recensional Lucianic reading.

1:24 [25 LXX] τὴν θυσίαν ἣν ἐποίει ἐξ ἡμερῶν εἰς ἡμέρας τῷ κυρίῳ *hostiam dierum quam faciebat ex diebus in diebus*

τὴν θυσίαν A B M O *CI*^{-731mg} b 68' f 29 55 71 158 707] + τῶν ἡμερῶν (+ αὐτοῦ 93) *L* rel

The whole clause is lacking in the MT. The sacrifice that Elkanah and his family came to Shiloh to offer is identified as *חֵלֶב הַזֶּבַח* τὴν θυσίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν in 1:21 (and again in 2:19). In all likelihood the notion comes from there. The very wide support for the reading confirms that it is an early variant.

2:11 καὶ κατέλιπον αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον κυρίου ... τὸ παιδάριον ἦν λειτουργῶν τῷ προσώπῳ κυρίου ἐνώπιον Ηλὶ *Et reliquit ibi puerū ante dōm ... puer erat seruiens dōmo ante faciem heli*

⁴² There is, however, an instance of a finite verb in Greek that is rendered with both a finite verb and a present participle: 6:4 εἶπαν] εἶπον *L*; *responderunt dicentes* La¹¹⁵.

⁴³ Brock, *Recensions*, 250: “This case is doubtful, for there are examples of the reverse where *לְאִמֶּר* is concerned.”

προσώπῳ κυρίου] Κυρίῳ *L*; *dmo* La¹¹⁵; cf. יהוה־תֵּשׁ MT
 ἐνώπιον] πρὸ προσώπου *M L C' a* 29 71 158 318 554^c 707; *ante faciem*
 La¹¹⁵; cf. יְהוָה־תֵּשׁ MT

Elsewhere when the word πρόσωπον is used in idioms describing the presence of someone, La¹¹⁵ renders it with *facies* (1:14, 4:17 ἐκ προσώπου *a facie/faciem*, 1:22 τῷ προσώπῳ *ante faciem*, 14:13 κατὰ πρόσωπον *faciem*, 14:25 κατὰ πρόσωπον *contra faciem*). The word ἐνώπιον, however, is rendered with *ante* (2:11; 9:24 [twice]; 10:19, 25; 14:18), *coram* (1:15, 3:21, 4:3, 11:10), *in conspectu* (1:25, 3:18), *cum* (1:26 ἐνώπιόν σου *tecum*), or *ab* (4:2). This makes it certain that La¹¹⁵ follows both *L*-readings here. The change from προσώπῳ κυρίου to Κυρίῳ seems like a recensional smoothing of the text – it is not necessarily Hebraizing. However, the several expressions “before the Lord” and “to the face of the Lord” (NETS) might motivate the Latin translator to smooth the expression independently. Brock includes the latter change (ἐνώπιον] πρὸ προσώπου) in Hexaplaric approximations,⁴⁴ but its attestation by especially *a*, 29, and 71 point rather to an early variant.

4:7 οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι] pr. σφόδρα *V s*^{-64'}; pr. *ualde* La¹¹⁵; + σφόδρα *L* 799

The addition of σφόδρα ‘much’ in *V L* 799 *s*^{-64'} is probably an early variant: *V*, 799, and *s* are generally free from Lucianic influence.

4:13 ἐπὶ τοῦ δίφρου] + αὐτοῦ *V L*⁻⁸² *CI* 799 29 318; *in sellam suam* La¹¹⁵

6:7 ἀπαγάγετε τὰ τέκνα ἀπὸ ὅπισθεν αὐτῶν *abducite*⁴⁵ *filios eorum ab eis*

τέκνα *A B O b* 68' *f* 71 158 245 707] + αὐτῶν rel; + *eorum* La¹¹⁵ = בְּנֵי־הוֹם
 MT

While both of these explications could fit in the tendencies of the Lucianic recensor (and the latter might be Hebraizing), their attestation points to early variants.

6:8 καὶ θήσετε ἐν θέματι βερσεχθαν ἐκ μέρους αὐτῆς *et ponite praemium bergas ad latus eius*

βερσεχθαν *B*^{c(*)}⁴⁶ (*CII*) 121(-509) (*s*^{-92.488}) 68' (244 460)] βαεργαζ *V L CI a*
d^{-68'} 29 (55) 71 158 245 318 554 (707); εργαζ *f*, αργοζ *A (O)* *Tht Schol Reg*
 20; cf. בִּרְגָאִם MT

⁴⁴ Brock, *Recensions*, 149.

⁴⁵ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 167: *reducite* = Belsheim.

⁴⁶ MSS in parenthesis contain minor variants.

6:11 καὶ ἔθεντο ... τὸ θέμα εργαβ καὶ τοὺς μῦς τοὺς χρυσοῦς *et inposuerunt ... premium bergas et mures aureos*

εργαβ] εργαζ V CII *a f s*^{-92.488} 29 55^c 71 158 245 318 707; βαεργαζ 98^c-379 488; αργοζ A (O); cf. 𐤁𐤓𐤁𐤍 MT
fin] + καὶ τὰς ἔδρας τὰς χρυσᾶς ἔθηκαν ἐν θέματι βαεργαζ (εργαζ 121 314)
ἐκ πλαγίων αὐτῆς L CI 119^{mg}(vid)121^{mg} 314-488 55 (158) (318) 554^{mg} 731^(mg); cf. 𐤁𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤁𐤓𐤁𐤍 MT

6:15 τὸ θέμα εργαβ *premium bergas*

εργαβ B *b d* 244 460] εργαζ V C' ⁻³⁷⁹ *a f s*^{-92.488} 29 71 158 245 707; αργοζ A (O); βαεργαζ L 379 488 318 554; cf. 𐤁𐤓𐤁𐤍 MT

All three of these instances must be taken into consideration although Voogd cites only one of them (6:15). The translator of 1 Samuel apparently did not know the word 𐤁𐤓𐤁𐤍 ‘box, chest’ but provided a transcription. The word θέμα (Muraoka: “*that in which sth is placed: coffer*”) is probably a secondary doublet in all three verses.⁴⁷ If the original readings are βερσεχθαν (v. 8) and εργαβ (vv. 11 and 15) the variant readings are easily explained as attempts to provide a more accurate transcription. In L, the preferred reading is βαεργαζ (in vv. 8, 15 and in the plus in v. 11), which is a transcription for 𐤁𐤓𐤁𐤍 in v. 8. The Lucianic recensor apparently attempts to systematize the usage, but overlooks the first occurrence in v. 11. The attestation of the reading βαεργαζ, however, reveals that it originates as an early variant.

The following, rather long, entry is about the terminology for ‘tribe’ and ‘clan.’

10:19–21 κατὰ τὰ σκῆπτρα ὑμῶν καὶ κατὰ τὰς φυλάς ὑμῶν (20) ... πάντα τὰ σκῆπτρα Ἰσραὴλ ... σκῆπτρον Βενιαμιν (21) ... σκῆπτρον Βενιαμιν εἰς φυλάς ... φυλὴ Ματταρι ... τὴν φυλὴν Ματταρι *secundum trib- uestras et secundum milia uestra* (20) ... *omnes tribus israel ... tribus beniamin* (21) ... *tribus beniamin secundum cognationes ... cognationis mattharin ... cognationem mattharin*

19 σκῆπτρα] φυλάς M^{mg} L 554^{mg}; *trib-* La¹¹⁵
τὰς φυλάς B M V CI *a*^{-119c} 121 68' *f* 488 29 55 71 158 245 318 707]
χιλιάδας φυλῶν 509; χιλιάδας L *rel*; *milia*⁴⁸ La¹¹⁵

⁴⁷ Brock, *Recensions*, 160–1: “The manuscript tradition provides a doublet to 𐤁𐤓𐤁𐤍 ... perhaps it is θέμα that is the secondary element.”

⁴⁸ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 162: *familias (uestras)* = Belsheim. Following Belsheim’s reading, Voogd includes this in his list “Agreements of L^b with G against H.”

20 πάντα τὰ σκήπτρα] πάσας τὰς φυλάς M V L C' a f 29 71 158 245
318 554^{mg} 707; *omnes tribus* La¹¹⁵
σκήπτρον] φυλή L 554^c; *tribus* La¹¹⁵

21 σκήπτρον] (τὴν) φυλήν L⁻⁹³ 68 554^{mg}; τῇ φυλῇ 93; *tribus* La¹¹⁵
εἰς φυλάς] κατὰ πατριάν 19'; κατὰ πατριάς L^{-19'} 554^{mg}; *secundum
cognitiones* La¹¹⁵
φυλή] πατριά L 554^c; *cognitionis* La¹¹⁵
φυλήν] πατριάν L 554^{mg}; *cognitionem* La¹¹⁵

Cf. 9:21 τοῦ μικροῦ σκήπτρου φυλῆς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τῆς φυλῆς τῆς ἐλαχίστης
ἐξ ὅλου σκήπτρου Βενιαμὴν *de minima tribu israel et cognatio mea mi-
nor est omnibus cognitionibus cognatio beniamin*

σκήπτρου 1^o] *tribu* La¹¹⁵
φυλῆς 1^o] ἐκ τῶν φυλῶν L 318; > La¹¹⁵
τῆς 1^o – σκήπτρου 2^o] ἡ πατριά μου ὀλιγοστή παρὰ πάσας τὰς πατριάς
L Tht 1 Reg. 552; *et cognatio mea minor est omnibus cognitionibus
cognatio* La¹¹⁵

The word used for ‘tribe’ is consistently σκήπτρον in the B-text, φυλή in the L-text, and *tribus*⁴⁹ in La¹¹⁵. By contrast, ‘clan’ (NJB) is φυλή in the B-text, πατριά in the L-text, and *cognatio* in La¹¹⁵. The only exceptions to this scheme are the readings χιλιάδας in L and the majority and *milia* in La¹¹⁵ in 10:19. There the question is undoubtedly of an early variant. In the other instances, however, the usage in La¹¹⁵ may merely exhibit the chosen terminology of the translator. Discussing Josephus’ reading in 9:21 (see p. 32) it was noted that, according to Brock, in the LXX in general φυλή corresponds to שִׁבְטָא and this has caused confusion and motivated the change to πατριά in L.⁵⁰

10:23 καὶ ἔδραμεν = MT] + Σαμουήλ 247 L CI 29 55 318; *et cucurrit*⁵¹ *samuel*
La¹¹⁵

This is an explication of subject that may have happened independently in several textual traditions. Tov includes this instance in the category “*boc₂e₂* add subjects of objects (these additions could reflect variants).”⁵²

⁴⁹ In 14:27 where σκήπτρον is used in its concrete meaning ‘staff’ it is rendered in La¹¹⁵ with *uirgae regalis*.

⁵⁰ Brock, *Recensions*, 286.

⁵¹ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 169: *excurrit* = Belsheim.

⁵² Tov, “Lucian”, 112.

10:26 καὶ Σαουλ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ εἰς Γαβαα *et saluauit*⁵³ *domū suam in collem*

εἰς] ἐν *b* 44 158 245; > 731*; *in* La¹¹⁵
Γαβαα]⁵⁴ τὸν βουνόν M^{mg} *L* 554^c; *collem* La¹¹⁵

11:4 εἰς Γαβαα] (τὸν) βουνόν *L*; *in collem* La¹¹⁵

According to Brock, the reading βουνόν is an early gloss.⁵⁵

8.2.4 La¹¹⁵ and *L* Agree in the Original Reading

In the following nine cases the agreement between La¹¹⁵ and *L* may be in the original reading.

1:18 εὗρεν ἡ δούλη σου χάριν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου *inueniat ancilla tua gratiam ante oculos tuos*

εὗρεν] εὔροι *L* 731^{mg} *d*^{-68'(.125)} 554 Chr *Anna* 2,6; *inueniat* La¹¹⁵

The subjunctive *inueniat* in La¹¹⁵ indisputably reflects the optative reading in *L*. The translator of 1 Samuel does use the optative, e.g., in the near context: 1:17 תְּהִי־נָא יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׁלַח אֶת־יָדוֹ וְיָצִיא אֶת־יָדָיו מִן־הַבַּיִת וְיִסָּר אֶת־הָעָם אֲלֵי־בָנִים אֲלֵי־בָנִים אֲלֵי־בָנִים ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ δώη σοι πᾶν αἵτημά σου, 1:23 וְיִסָּר אֶת־הָעָם אֲלֵי־בָנִים אֲלֵי־בָנִים אֲלֵי־בָנִים ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ δώη σοι πᾶν αἵτημά σου. If the optative is original,⁵⁶ the other reading is an early transcriptional error – that it is from an uncommon form to a more usual one enhances this possibility.

2:10c – *quia iustus est*

– A B 56 Syh] δίκαιος ὢν *L* rel La¹¹⁵

The overwhelming attestation to the plus reveals that it is the OG reading⁵⁷ and that explains the agreement between La¹¹⁵ and *L* (and the majority of the MSS).

2:14 ἐπάταξεν A B *f* (=Rahlfs)] ἐπάταξαν 121 68'; ἐπάτασεν *O*; καθῆκεν M V C' *a s* 29 55 71 244 245 318 460 554 707; καθῆκαν 158; ἐπάταξεν καὶ καθῆκεν 509; καθίει *L*; κεκράτηκεν *d*^{-68'}; *mittebat* La¹¹⁵

⁵³ The edition notes that this word is an error for *saul abiit*.

⁵⁴ There are variant forms for Γαβαα both in 10:26 and 11:4, but they are not relevant for the present discussion.

⁵⁵ Brock, *Recensions*, 327.

⁵⁶ It is accepted as the original reading in the preliminary critical text in Aejmelaeus' edition.

⁵⁷ This is the reading of the preliminary critical text in Aejmelaeus' edition.

According to Aejmelaeus, the original reading is καθῆκεν (aorist): the imperfect in *L* is due to conformation with the surrounding imperfects that describe the actions of the priest's servant (vs. 13: ἤρχετο, vs. 14: ἐλάμβανεν, vs. 15: ἤρχετο, ἔλεγεν). The verb πατάσσω in A B O b f 68' is a more literal equivalent for the verb נכה in the MT.⁵⁸ The verb *mitto* in La¹¹⁵ can only be an equivalent for καθίημι, but whether it attests the imperfect (*L*) or the aorist (majority) is not at all clear. On the whole the translation in La¹¹⁵ is very faithful in rendering the Greek imperfect with the Latin imperfect – I counted 29 such cases in 1 Samuel. There are, however, instances of present for imperfect (14:19 ἐλάλει *loquitur*), perfect for imperfect (11:11 ἔτυπτον *percussit*; 14:32 ἔσθιεν *manducauit*), imperfect for perfect (14:25 ἡρίστα *prandebat* [*sic!*]), and imperfect for aorist (11:11 διεθερμάνθη *calesceret*; 14:18 ἦρεν *ferebat*; 14:19 ἐπλήθυνεν *increscebat*).⁵⁹ The imperfects in the near context could have motivated the Latin translator to use the imperfect here also; the whole passage goes:

(13) *et iustificationem sacerdotis a populo omni qui sacrificabat et ueniebat filius sacerdotis quo modo cocta erat caro et arpagō tridens erat in manu eius* (14) *et mittebat eum in caccabū magnum aut in aereum aut in ollam omne quodcumq̄ ascendebat in arpagone sumebat sibi sacerdos secundum haec faciebant omni populo israel qui ueniebat sacrificare dñō in selom* (15) *Et priusquam immolaretur adeps ante dñm ueniebat filius sacerdotis et dicebat homini qui sacrificabat ...*

These considerations suggest that it is best to accept La¹¹⁵ as a witness to the original verb (καθίημι) but disregard its attestation to the imperfect in this instance.

2:15 θυμιαθῆναι τὸ στέαρ *immolaretur adeps ante dñm*

στέαρ A B O b 68' f Syh = MT] + ἐνώπιον Κυρίου *L* rel; + *ante dñm* La¹¹⁵

The long reading is probably the original one:⁶⁰ the minus is due to early Hebraizing revision.

3:13 יְדִי־וְשֵׁאֵי בְּיָדָיו אֲדִיקָאִים וְיָזֶן אֹתוֹ *iniustitias filiorum eius quas*⁶¹ *ipse sciuit*

αὐτοῦ A B M O b 68' 158 707] + ἄς (αἷς *L*^{-19.82} 318 554; ἐν αἷς 82) ἔγνω (ἔγνω 46' 799 71) *L* rel La¹¹⁵

⁵⁸ Aejmelaeus, "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel", 137–8.

⁵⁹ Imperfect is also used in rendering the expression for 'arm-bearer' in 14:12, 13, 14, 17: ὁ αἵρων τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ *qui portabat arma eius*.

⁶⁰ This is the reading of the preliminary critical text in Aejmelaeus' edition.

⁶¹ Voogd, following Belsheim, omits *eius* and, against Belsheim, reads *quae* pro *quas*. "Critical and Comparative Study", 166.

Brock suggests that ἄς ἔγνω is a Hexaplaric addition.⁶² However, the case does not seem to be so simple; while there is a Hebrew counterpart to the Greek plus in the MT (נִשְׁכַּח-רָשָׁע), there is none for the words υἱὼν αὐτοῦ that are, nonetheless, attested by all Greek MSS. The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX – and, indeed, the original Hebrew text – might have been בְּנֵי בְעֵבֶר and in the MT the latter word has dropped out for transcriptional reasons. The attestation for the Greek minus (esp. M, 68', and 707) suggests that it is not Hebraizing; rather, it might be an early corruption.

4:10 παταίει ἀνὴρ Ἰσραηλ *uictus uir israel ab alienigenis*⁶³

Ἰσραηλ A B O b 68'-74-120-134 = MT] + ἐνώπιον (τῶν) ἀλλοφύλων *L rel;*
+ *ab alienigenis* La¹¹⁵

Brock suggests that the plus in *L rel* is an early addition coined by v. 2: καὶ ἔπταισεν ἀνὴρ Ἰσραηλ ἐνώπιον ἀλλοφύλων.⁶⁴ While this is possible, I would rather suggest that the longer reading is actually the original one and B attests an early approximation.

9:24 φάγε ὅτι εἰς μαρτύριον τέθειταί σοι παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους *manduca quoniam in testimoniū positum tibi est a populo*

παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους B 93^{mg}(vid) CI^{-731mg} 509 d 244 460 554^{txt}; *propter ceteros* La^M] παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀλλ' οὓς O; παρὰ τοῦ ἀνῶ A; παρὰ τῷ θῶ 799; παρὰ τοῦ λαοῦ *rel; a populo* La¹¹⁵; מִן הָעָם MT

Tov includes this instance in the category “*boc₂e₂* reflect the OG from which the corrupt text form of the other MSS has developed.”⁶⁵ If the original reading is indeed παρὰ τοῦ λαοῦ, it would suppose a *Vorlage* only a little different from the MT.

9:27 αὐτῶν καταβαινόντων εἰς μέρος τῆς πόλεως *et descendentibus eis de summo*⁶⁶ *ciuitatis*

εἰς μέρος] εἰς ἄκρον *L*^{-108mg} 554^{mg}; *de summo* La¹¹⁵

Although ἄκρος as a noun can mean ‘the farthest end,’ when connected with a city it means the highest point, the acropolis. This creates a semantic problem because it is not possible to “go down” (καταβαίνω) to the highest

⁶² Brock, *Recensions*, 142.

⁶³ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 167: *israel a conspectu alienigenarum* = Belsheim.

⁶⁴ So Brock, *Recensions*, 138.

⁶⁵ Tov, “Lucian”, 111. He suggests that the underlying Hebrew reading for the OG reading was מִן הָעָם.

⁶⁶ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 167: *et descenderunt in loco summo* = Belsheim.

place. In the Greek MSS there are no attempts to correct the verb to ἀναβαίνω, but in La¹¹⁵ the problem is avoided with the reading *descendentibus eis de summo*. The word *summus*, nevertheless, reflects the *L*-reading. If μέρος were original it would be the only rendering of מֶרֶץ of its kind in 1 Sam. It seems, therefore, that *L* might have preserved the original reading, which was altered to μέρος to avoid the connotation of acropolis, into which one cannot descend.⁶⁷ While this conclusion is very tentative, for the present text-historical purposes the possibility is enough to include this reading in the category “La¹¹⁵ and *L* agree in the original reading.”⁶⁸

11:4 τοὺς λόγους A B O b] + τούτους *L* rel; *haec uerba*⁶⁹ La¹¹⁵

The possibility of whether the minus in A B O b might be a Hebraizing omission should be considered.

8.2.5 La¹¹⁵ Possibly Agrees with *L* in a Recensional Reading

In the following 15 cases La¹¹⁵ may be dependent on a Lucianic recensional reading. None of the cases, however, is particularly striking; in most instances either the attestation to the Greek reading or internal considerations lead one to think that something other than pure Lucianic influence in La¹¹⁵ is the reason for the agreements.

1:20 παρὰ κυρίου θεοῦ σαβαωθ ἡτησάμην αὐτόν *quoniā a d̄mō dō sabaoth omnipotente peti eū*

θεοῦ] > M O 52 a⁻⁵²⁷ d^{-68'} s 71 158 244 245 460 554; tr post σαβαωθ *L* σαβαωθ] > 125 158; + παντοκράτορος *L* d^{-68'} 554; + *omnipotente* La¹¹⁵

Both *L* and La¹¹⁵ have the divine epithet Sebaoth in both transcription and translation. In *L* this is recensional (Brock: “doublet”⁷⁰). The translator of La¹¹⁵ could have coined the addition independently.

⁶⁷ So Brock, *Recensions*, 259.

⁶⁸ Tov, “Lucian”, 111, however, includes this instance in the category “Translation technique”, probably suggesting that the lexical variants might witness competing OG renderings (see p. 11).

⁶⁹ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 170: *uerba haec*. Belsheim: *haec uerba*.

⁷⁰ Brock, *Recensions*, 144.

2:10a μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ δυνατὸς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ *non gloriatur sapiens in sua sapientia nec fortis in sua fortitudine*

φρόνιμος ... φρονήσει] σοφός ... σοφία *L* 44-106-107-125-610 71 460;
sapiens ... sapientia La¹¹⁵ La^M
δυνατὸς ... δυνάμει] ἰσχυρός ... ἰσχύι *L*; *fortis ... fortitudine* La¹¹⁵; *fortis ... virtute* La^M

La¹¹⁵ clearly follows the *L*-readings σοφός ... σοφία and ἰσχυρός ... ἰσχύι⁷¹ which, in turn are recensional; they result from conformation with the parallel passage in Jeremiah:

(22) Τάδε λέγει κύριος Μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ, (23) ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχᾶσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνείν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. (Jer 9:22–23)

The question is, however, whether this could happen in the Latin translation independently. In the Odes (3:10) the two attributes are σοφός and δυνατὸς – the old Göttingen edition by Rahlfs reports no variants. This is actually the form of the text preserved in 1 Samuel in 44-106-107-125-610 71 460.

4:2 καὶ παρατάσσονται οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι εἰς πόλεμον ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ *et constituerunt pugnam aduersus israel et*⁷² *commiserunt*

Ἰσραὴλ] + καὶ συνέβαλον *L* 318; + *et commiserunt* La¹¹⁵

Probably the Lucianic recensor felt the need to add “and they gathered.” La¹¹⁵ very likely follows the addition.

4:4 καθημένου χερουβὶμ *ubi sedebat cerubin*⁷³

καθημένου] οὗ ἐπεκάθητο *L* 554^c; *ubi sedebat* La¹¹⁵

The *L*-reading is obviously a recensional stylization of the text. The finite verb *sedebat* in La¹¹⁵ might exhibit the translator’s habit of rendering Greek participles with Latin finite constructions (see p. 145). However, the word *ubi* strongly points to the possibility that the Latin translator was rendering the *L*-reading οὗ, but understood it as the adverb ‘where’ rather than the genitive of the relative pronoun.⁷⁴ Tov includes this instance in the category “Translation

⁷¹ This is noted by the edition: Fischer et al., “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis”, 42–3.

⁷² Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 166 omits *et* = Belsheim.

⁷³ Voogd, “Critical and Comparative Study”, 167: *in Cherubin* = Belsheim.

⁷⁴ Fischer et al., “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis”, 46: “*ubi sedebat cerubin*: ου επεκαθητο τα χερουβιμ Lucian.”

technique,”⁷⁵ probably suggesting that the lexical variants might witness competing OG renderings (see p. 17).

4:7 οὗτοι οἱ θεοὶ ἤκασιν πρὸς αὐτούς *hii sunt dii ebreorum uenerunt ad eos*

οὗτοι – ἤκασιν] οὗτος ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν (> 245 554) ἤκει (ἤκασι 245) *L* 245 554^c; *hii sunt dii ebreorum* La¹¹⁵; cf. מִלְאֵי אֱלֹהִים MT

This instance is cited by Voogd as a “unique reading in La^b”, but it is worth noting here. As the editors note, it is “uncertain whether the Latin translator added” the word *ebreorum* “or whether his *Vorlage* had *eorum* ... which was corrupted to *ebreorum*.”⁷⁶ The speakers are Philistines, and “the Hebrews” are mentioned in v. 6 (ἐν παρεμβολῇ τῶν Εβραίων *in castris ebreorū*), which could have cued the addition to the Latin translator. The plus of αὐτῶν in Greek is certainly recensional, as is the singular οὗτος ὁ θεός, which La¹¹⁵ does not follow.

4:7 οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη] οὐκ (>19') ἐγενήθη (+ ἐχθές 93) οὕτως *L*; *non est sic factum* La¹¹⁵; מְאִדָּה הָיְתָה כֵּן MT

This is a very complicated case. Brock notes that often *L* attests the middle aorist form of the verb γίνομαι when most of the MSS give the aorist passive (e.g., ἐγένετο/ἐγενήθη).⁷⁷ Because here the aorist passive ἐγενήθη is retained in *L*, Brock suggests that it might be original.⁷⁸ Brock lists the reading οὕτως under the lexical variants of *L*,⁷⁹ but it is the only one of its kind in 1 Samuel. Accordingly, it is unclear what the nature of the *L*-reading is in this instance. Moreover, although the editors of La¹¹⁵ seem very certain that the Latin text follows the *L*-reading,⁸⁰ it is not all that clear: The Latin translator probably felt that a passive construction was appropriate to describe what has or has not happened and chose the rendering *non est ... factum* accordingly. That may correspond either to the Greek perfect (B and the majority) or aorist (*L*). The choice of the adverb *sic* for τοιοῦτος ‘such’ (instead of *talis*) might then result from the passive construction.

6:12 καὶ οὐ μεθίσταντο *et non declinabant*

μεθίσταντο] ἐξέκλινον (-ναν 19'-82) *L* 554^{mg}; *declinabant* La¹¹⁵; מִדָּוָה MT

⁷⁵ Tov, “Lucian”, 111.

⁷⁶ Fischer et al., “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis”, 46.

⁷⁷ This is often seen as one of the hallmarks of the Lucianic recension; cf. p. 4.

⁷⁸ Brock, *Recensions*, 232.

⁷⁹ Brock, *Recensions*, 285.

⁸⁰ Fischer et al., “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis”, 46: “*non est sic factum*: ουκ εγενηθη ουτως.”

Brock suggests that ἐκκλίνω is “probably Hexaplaric,” corresponding to the Hebrew verb סור (both mean ‘to turn aside’).⁸¹ Since *declino* is etymologically connected with ἐκκλίνω, La¹¹⁵ may reflect that Greek verb. However, *declino* is also the most suitable Latin verb for the meaning ‘to turn aside.’⁸²

9:22 εἰσήγαγεν αὐτούς ... καὶ ἔθετο αὐτοῖς τόπον *induxit eos ... et constituit illis locum*

ἔθετο] ἔταξεν L 554^{mg 83}; *constituit* La¹¹⁵

In La¹¹⁵ the verbs τίθημι, διατίθημι, and παρατίθημι are constantly rendered with an expression containing the verbal stem *pono*: 6:8 θήσετε ... θήσετε *inponetis ... ponite*, 11 ἔθεντο *inposuerunt*, 15 ἔθεντο [*pos*]uer; 9:23 θεῖναι *ut poneret*, 24 παρέθηκεν ... παράθες ... τέθειται σοι *posuit ... pone ... positum tibi est*; 10:25 ἔθηκεν *posuit*; 11:1 διάθου ἡμῖν διαθήκην *dispone nobis testamentum*, 2 διαθήσομαι ... θήσομαι *disponam ... ponam*, 11 ἔθετο *disposuit*.⁸⁴ To be sure, considering the semantic fields of the Greek verbs τίθημι and τάσσω, the Latin verb *constituo* may function as an equivalent for either one. This is seen, e.g., in the Vulgate: Matt 26:19, 27:10 συνέταξεν *constituit*; 28:16 ἐτάξατο *constituerat*; Heb 1:2 ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον *constituit heredem*. Accordingly, it is probable but not conclusive that La¹¹⁵ attests the verb τάσσω, which, in turn, is likely one of the lexical variants of the Lucianic recensor.⁸⁵

10:18 ἐξείλαμην ὑμᾶς ἐκ χειρὸς Φαραω βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐκ πασῶν τῶν βασιλειῶν *eripui eos de manu farao regis aegypti et de manu omnium regum*

καὶ ἐκ] + χειρῶν L^{-19'}; + χειρός 19'; + *manu* La¹¹⁵; 𐤒𐤍 MT
 βασιλειῶν] βασιλέων 127 55*; > 247; *regum* La¹¹⁵

Brock suggests that 19' has preserved the original reading which has been “dropped in the other mss to avoid repetition.”⁸⁶ However, the opposite seems at least as plausible: that the recensor felt the need to repeat the word ‘hand’ (whether in the singular or plural) or it is a Hexaplaric addition preserved in L. At first glance it seems that La¹¹⁵ undoubtedly follows the reading χειρός of 19', but it is noteworthy that the word βασιλεία ‘kingdom’ is changed to *rex*

⁸¹ Brock, *Recensions*, 271.

⁸² No comparison with other occurrences of the verb μεθίστημι is possible since none of those verses in 1–4 Reigns is preserved in La¹¹⁵.

⁸³ In MS 554 the reading is – in all probability erroneously – indicated as a variant for the word εἰσήγαγεν.

⁸⁴ There is no correspondence in La¹¹⁵ for the words καὶ τάδε προσθείη in 3:17. The only visible rendering for προστίθημι in 1 Samuel is addo: 3:21 προσέθετο *addidit*.

⁸⁵ Brock, *Recensions*, 292.

⁸⁶ Brock, *Recensions*, 157.

‘king.’ While this may be just a misreading (βασιλέων instead of βασιλειῶν, this is very likely the reason for the variant in 127 55*), some polishing by the translator might be at work here: “from the hand of the Pharaoh and from (the hand of) all the kingdoms” sounds like a mixed metaphor. If the mentioning of “the Pharaoh” and “hand” motivated the Latin translator to change or “correct” the word βασιλειῶν to *regum*, he might have added *manu* independently as well.

10:21 τὴν φυλὴν Ματταρι εἰς ἄνδρας *cognitionem mattharin per singulos uiros*

εἰς ἄνδρας] κατὰ ἄνδρα ἕνα *L* 554^{mg}; *per singulos uiros* *La*¹¹⁵

Brock includes the instance in his list of “Grammatical & Syntactical Variants” in *L*: “distributive κατὰ + acc. replaces hebraizing εἰς.” *La*¹¹⁵ does not follow *L* in the word order or the singular. Moreover, the choice of preposition may be merely contextual. This makes one doubt whether even the word *singulos* reflects the word ἕνα in *L*.

14:23 καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἦν μετὰ Σαουλ *et israel erat cum saul*

πᾶς ὁ λαός] (πᾶς 127) ιῆλ *L*; *israel* *La*¹¹⁵; MT (v. 24)

According to Brock, this is a Hexaplaric approximation, the word Ἰσραήλ coming from the reading ִיִּשְׂרָאֵל in the next verse in the MT.⁸⁷

14:32 καὶ ἐκλίθη ὁ λαὸς εἰς τὰ σκῦλα *e[t im]petum fecit populus in predam*

ἐκλίθη] ὥρμησε(v) *L* d 92^{mg}(sub θ') 318 554^c; *[im]petum fecit* *La*¹¹⁵

See also the same variation unit in section 9.2.2 (p. 173). The reading ὥρμησεν is most probably recensional, the marginal reading in MS 92 suggests a Hexaplaric origin. The expression *impetum facere* ‘attack’ is used as a rendering for the verb ὀρμάω ‘set out, rush’ in the Vulgate (2 Macc 10:16; Acts 7:56, 19:29).

14:33 ἀπηγγέλη] ἀπήγγειλαν *L*; *nuntiauerunt* *La*¹¹⁵

14:34 εἶπατε αὐτοῖς προσαγαγεῖν ἐνταῦθα ἕκαστος τὸν μόσχον αὐτοῦ ... καὶ σφαζέτω *dicite illis adducite hoc unusquisque uitulum suum ... et occidite*

προσαγαγεῖν (προσάγειν B 44)] προσαγάγετε *L*; *adducite* *La*¹¹⁵

⁸⁷ Brock, *Recensions*, 152.

σφαζέτω B V a 509 f 29 55 71 245 318 707] σφάζετε L; σφαζάτω rel;
occidite La¹¹⁵

In these instances the Lucianic recensor smooths the text by changing the verbal forms to active (14:33) or imperative (14:34). La¹¹⁵ may be dependent on these or it may simply do the same kind of smoothing independently.

14:34 καὶ σφαζέτω ἐπὶ τούτου καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀμάρτητε τῷ κυρίῳ τοῦ ἐσθίειν σὺν
τῷ αἵματι *et occidite super lapidem hunc* [page break]

ἐπί] + τοῦ λίθου L d 244 318 460 554; + τῷ λίθῳ 509; > 52; + *lapidem*
La¹¹⁵
τούτου] τούτῳ 509; + καὶ φάγετε (-ται 82) L⁸⁸; + καὶ φάγεται (-τω 247;
-ται 44-106-107-125-370-610) αὐτά A O d 554; > 52; מִן הַבָּרֶקֶת מִן הַבָּרֶקֶת MT

There are three features in the different pluses: the mentioning of “(this) stone” (L 509 d 244 318 460 554 La¹¹⁵), “eating” (A O L d 554), and “them” (A O d 554). The mentioning of the stone could be a Lucianic recensional addition motivated by the previous verse (κυλίσσατέ μοι λίθον ἑνταῦθα μέγαν). However, it is attested also by MSS that do not characteristically follow the Lucianic text (244, 460; d agrees with L only in Hexaplaric readings shared by both traditions, see p. 24). Moreover, since the reading is against the MT, it should be considered whether it was, after all, the original reading. Then again, the exhortation to “eat them” is Hexaplaric. It is preserved in its entirety in A O d 554 and partly (omitting αὐτά) in L. Whether La¹¹⁵ follows this reading or not is impossible to tell: there is a page break after the words *super lapidem hunc* and the next page has not been preserved.

8.3 Conclusion

It was noted in the Prolegomena that Voogd posited 70 agreements between La¹¹⁵ and L. Six of these were discarded because the reading had changed from Belsheim’s edition (used by Voogd) to the new edition by Fischer et al., whereas three new agreements were found. In 27 cases it was found that the agreement is only apparent or coincidental. Of the remaining 40 agreements 16 are in an early variant. These variants are often attested by a large number of LXX witnesses and for that reason it cannot be demonstrated that La¹¹⁵ was dependent on the L group in those cases. In nine cases it was found that La¹¹⁵ and L agree in preserving the original reading against B. In most of those instances La¹¹⁵ and L are supported by the majority of the MSS but twice only by very few other witnesses:

⁸⁸ MS 127: καὶ φάγετε sub asterisco.

1:18 εὕρεν] εὔροι *L* 731^{mg} *d* ^{-68⁷(.125)} 554 Chr; *inueniat* La¹¹⁵

9:27 μέρος] ἄκρον *L* ^{-108mg} 554^{mg}; (*de*) *summo* La¹¹⁵

Fifteen cases, however, remain problematic. In each of those there is at least a faint possibility that La¹¹⁵ follows a Lucianic recensional reading. This allows at most the conclusion that some sporadic contamination with the Lucianic Greek text has taken place in the transmission of the Latin translation. A more thorough study of La¹¹⁵ in all the books of Kingdoms and, indeed, of the Old Latin witnesses of the Historical Books in general is called for to refine the conclusions drawn in this chapter. I hope, however, that the present treatise may provide the impetus for such a study.

9 The Qumran Texts of 1 Samuel

9.1 Prolegomena

The aim of this chapter is to examine the evidence from Qumran that has been presented in support of Frank Moore Cross's theory of the proto-Lucianic recension (see p. 14). The main source is the publication of the Samuel fragments from Qumran Cave 4 in the series *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (DJD).¹ The publication presents the photographs and reconstructions of all the fragments of the three Qumran Samuel scrolls. It also contains discussions about the reliability of the readings as well as brief analyses of the variant readings in the text. I have compiled from the publication all the variation units in which the actual or reconstructed Qumran reading deviates from the MT and both Hebrew readings are suggested to be reflected in two or more different Greek readings.

None of the existing columns of the scrolls have survived completely. Only occasionally are both margins visible. This makes it extremely difficult to reconstruct the lost words according to calculations of character widths and line lengths. Some assistance is gained by the procedure 'vertical alignment':

By vertical alignment we refer to placing each letter and space preserved on a given fragment precisely above or below the letter or space on either the line above, or the line below, or where all three lines of the fragment are extant, aligning it both above and below. Where the preserved fragments are substantial in size, this procedure checks that the position of letters and words are precisely where they belong on the lines of script. Where there is a lacuna in our line of script, and reconstruction is desiderated, vertical alignment can often sharply narrow the choice of possible readings that can be fitted into the lacuna.²

The vertical alignment, however, is of little assistance when a fragment of only a few lines without either margin should be joined, for example, below a column. Even when some words or letters in the first line of the fragment can be identified with corresponding items in the MT or the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX, there is no way to tell what was or was not between the first line of the fragment and the last line of the rest of the column. To illustrate this: If the editor supposes there was, say, one word less than in the MT, he should move the fragment a little to the right. Or if the editor supposes there was a long plus of several lines in the Qumran scroll, all he needs to do is to move the fragment

¹ Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel* = DJD XVII.

² DJD XVII, 24.

downwards. In the following discussion, many reconstructions must be rejected because of this problem.

Another problem in the reconstructions of DJD XVII is the assumption that when *L* deviates from the rest of the LXX tradition it reflects a Hebrew reading of the same tradition as 4QSam^a – unless the *L*-reading seems recensional on internal grounds. Therefore if the line length and the vertical alignment allows, the reading of 4QSam^a is reconstructed by retroverting *L*. If in such a case any other existing Hebrew reading (or a plausible retroversion) could fit in the lacuna of the Qumran scroll, the variation unit in question cannot be used to demonstrate the affiliation of 4QSam^a and *L*. The Qumran readings that are fairly certain are discussed in sections 9.2.2 (4QSam^a) and 9.2.4 (4QSam^b). At the end of those sections I have provided lists of uncertain reconstructions.

The third problem in the reconstructions of DJD XVII is the estimation of line lengths only in terms of character count. This can be improved by use of estimated average line lengths in millimeters. In this I rely greatly on Edward D. Herbert's calculations of average character width.³ A "reconstructed width" for any reconstructed line can be calculated by counting the frequencies of all the different characters (treating the space as a character) and multiplying them by the average width of the corresponding letters in Herbert's calculations. Whenever calculating the average line length for a column, I compare the results to Herbert's "Table of Critical Deviations". Using the normal distribution, it is possible to estimate how large a deviation from the column (or section) average is acceptable on a certain significance level.⁴

Andrew Fincke's edition of 2001⁵ for 4QSam^a has been checked in each case. The DJD edition, however, includes several fragments that were not yet identified in 2001 or were overlooked by Fincke.

9.2 Analysis

9.2.1 The Character of 4QSam^a

4QSam^a is dated to 50–25 BCE. Its script is a formal and elegant bookhand.⁶ Along with the DJD edition Cross and Saley discuss the textual character of the

³ E.D. Herbert, *Reconstructing Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Method Applied to the Reconstruction of 4QSam^a* (STDJ 22; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 10, 80.

⁴ Herbert, *Reconstructing*, 81–2. "Significance level" means roughly the probability of having a line with a certain deviation from the average. For example, in Herbert's "smoothed" table of "Adjusted Reconstructed Widths" in a section wider than 95.5 mm the significance level for a 5% deviation is 5% at the minimum and for an 8% deviation 1%. This means that if the section average were, say, 100 mm, one would expect 95% of the observed lines to be within 95–105 (= average \pm 5%) mm in length. A line shorter than 92 mm or longer than 108 mm (= average \pm 8%) could be expected only with a 1% probability.

⁵ A. Fincke, *The Samuel Scroll From Qumran: 4QSam^a Restored and Compared to the Septuagint and 4QSam^c* (STDJ 43; Leiden: Brill, 2001).

⁶ DJD XVII, 5.

MS in a separate article.⁷ They aim at showing that the patterns of agreements between 4QSam^a and other witnesses are basically similar in the *καίγε*- and non-*καίγε* sections: 4QSam^a is more often in agreement with the hypothetical Old Greek against the MT than vice versa. Cross and Saley give the agreements between 4QSam^a and other witnesses as convenient tables. The following reproduces the relevant parts in their table concerning the non-*καίγε* section.

Table 2. Agreements between 4QSam^a and L against the B-text in 1 Sam and in 2 Sam 1:1–9:13 according to Cross and Saley⁸

Type Number	Pattern	Superior Readings	Inferior Readings	Unclassified Readings	Total Readings
(3)	4QSam ^a <i>L</i> ≠ B MT	3 [4]	3 [9]	0 [2]	6 [15] (= 21)
(4)	4QSam ^a <i>L</i> ≠ B ≠ MT	2 [10]	2 [9]	5 [0]	9 [19] (= 28)
(6)	4QSam ^a MT <i>L</i> ≠ B	13 [15]	9 [9]	2 [10]	24 [34] (= 58)
Grand Total		18 [29]	14 [27]	7 [12]	39 [68] (= 107)

As seen in the table, the number of any kind of agreements between 4QSam^a and *L* against the B-text with/without the MT is 107, of which 68 are based on reconstructions. A total of 47 of these readings, of which 29 are reconstructed, are thought to give a reading closer to the original Hebrew than B and its allies (“Superior Readings”).

According to the theory of the proto-Lucianic recension, in the inferior readings of pattern 3 (4QSam^a *L* ≠ B MT) the agreement between 4QSam^a and *L* could result from Hebraizing correction towards a 4QSam^a-type of text in *L*. According to Cross and Saley, “the majority of the [inferior] ... readings are explicating pluses, and qualify as so-called Proto-Lucianic readings.”⁹ However, regardless of the original Hebrew, *L* may still retain the OG reading if B is corrected towards the MT. In the superior readings of this pattern the most

⁷ F.M. Cross/R.J. Saley, “A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel^a (4Q51)”, *DSD* 13,1 (2006): 46–54.

⁸ Cross/Saley, “Textual Character”, 47. Here are reproduced those parts of the table that concern the agreements between 4QSam^a and *L* against the B-text. The classifications “superior” and “inferior” are in respect of the original Hebrew text. The Gothic sigla in the pattern designations of Cross and Saley are replaced with the ones I use, retaining, however, the italic capital letter B for the authors’ “(Egyptian) Recension, represented especially by Bya₂” [= B *b*] (p. 47 n. 4). The number of reconstructed readings is given in square brackets. The “Grand Total” row is calculated by me.

⁹ Cross and Saley, “Textual Character”, 49. In this article and DJD XVII “proto-Lucianic” is spelled with a capital P. I have decided to retain the lowercase p even when discussing the theory of the proto-Lucianic recension.

plausible explanation would be that 4QSam^a retains the original Hebrew reading, which is also the reading of the *Vorlage* of the LXX, and *L* retains the OG reading.¹⁰ The status of the inferior readings in pattern 4 (4QSam^a *L* ≠ *B* ≠ MT) is similar to that of pattern 3 with the exception that in those readings *B* cannot represent corrections against the MT. However, even in those cases *B* can be otherwise corrupt and *L* may still retain the OG reading.

About pattern 6 (4QSam^a MT *L* ≠ *B*) Cross and Saley write: “In this category [*L*] appears to provide the Old Greek, with [*B*] having roughly a third of its readings defective owing either to *parablepsis* or to expansion with the addition of an explicating plus.”¹¹ However, that *L* retained the OG reading in every instance (as Cross and Saley seem to suggest) is not the only possible explanation for the readings of this category; it is equally possible – and often more likely as will be demonstrated in the analysis – that *L* attests a Hexaplaric reading and *B* retains the OG.

The above considerations emphasize that while theoretically in all the three patterns mentioned the agreement between 4QSam^a and *L* could be used to defend the theory of the proto-Lucianic recension, each pattern of agreement can be explained otherwise. In order to demonstrate the existence of the proto-Lucianic recension, one should find instances of indisputable agreement between 4QSam^a and *L* in readings that are secondary in Greek. In the following discussion, however, an overwhelming majority of the suggested agreements between 4QSam^a and *L* will be rejected. Some support for these negative conclusions has been gained by Richard Saley’s article “Proto-Lucian and 4QSam^a.”¹² Saley deals only with those supposed agreements in the non-καίτε section that are not based entirely on reconstructions (eleven in 1 Samuel and four in 2 Sam 1–9). For each reading he gives a rating 1–5 “of the likelihood that the reading of 4QSam^a should be considered proto-Lucianic,” ‘5’ indicating that the reading “fully meets the criteria for a proto-Lucianic reading.”¹³ Saley concludes:

The 15 readings ... were examined and rated for agreement with \mathfrak{G}^L ... Of these, three had a score of ‘5’ ... and two had a score of ‘4’ ... In addition, five others ... had a rating of ‘5r,’ that is, the appropriateness of the rating was dependent upon a reconstructed portion of the 4QSam^a reading being accepted as accurate. Now, even if, for the purpose of argumentation, it were to be assumed that all of the partial reconstructions are precisely correct – a conclusion beyond proof – we would still have only 10 4QSam^a readings exhibiting solid agreement (‘4’ or ‘5’) with \mathfrak{G}^L readings.¹⁴

Saley’s ratings for individual readings will be discussed in the analysis section.

¹⁰ There is the theoretical possibility that in the superior readings *B* does after all retain the OG reading that has been corrected in *L* to a reading that conforms with the original Hebrew readings, but instances of this kind of less simple explanation would be notoriously difficult to demonstrate.

¹¹ Cross/Saley, “Textual Character”, 49.

¹² R.J. Saley, “Proto-Lucian and 4QSam^a”, *BIOSCS* 41 (2008), 34–45.

¹³ Saley, “Proto-Lucian and 4QSam^a”, 36.

¹⁴ Saley, “Proto-Lucian and 4QSam^a”, 44–5.

9.2.2 Suggested Agreements between 4QSam^a and *L*

In this chapter I discuss all the variation units examined in the DJD that are of interest regarding the proto-Lucianic problem. In each variation unit a few words of context in the BHS and Rahlfs' LXX edition are given. This is followed by two brief apparatuses: the lemma in the first is the BHS reading and the Qumran reading is cited after it (with the exception of the first case in which a longer citation from DJD is in order). The second lemma is Rahlfs' text – it is followed by the *L*-reading (often supported by other witnesses) and often other readings as well.

1:28–2:1 וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ שָׁם לַיהוָה וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ חָנָה וְתַמָּר (2:1) ζῆ αὐτός
 χρῆσιν τῷ κυρίῳ (2:1) καὶ εἶπεν

4QSam^a [וְתַמָּר] ...¹⁵ [וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּ לַיהוָה]

κυρίῳ] + καὶ προσεκύνησαν (-σεν V 98-379 488 29 158; + ἐκεῖ V 98-379-731^{mg} 488 29) τῷ Κυρίῳ V L 98-379-731^{mg} 488 29 158 318 554 = MT; + καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ ἀννα O
 καὶ εἶπεν] pr καὶ προσηύξατο (ἡύξατο V 29) ἀννα A V L CI 488 29 158 318 554 Ruf *Orig. Hom. 1 Reg.* 14 = MT; pr καὶ προσηύξατο τῷ κῶ O

2:11 וַיִּלֶּךְ אֶלְקָנָה הַרְמָתָה καὶ κατέλειπον αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον κυρίου
 καὶ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀρμαθαίμ

κατέλειπον] -πεν B O 106 29 318¹⁶ Aeth; *reliquit* La¹¹⁵
 ἐκεῖ] > 488 460 707; + τον σαμουηλ O; post κυρίου tr L 158
 κυρίου] + καὶ προσεκύνησαν (-σεν 82) τῷ Κυρίῳ L 158 318 554

The Song of Hannah (1 Sam 2:1–10) is usually held to be an element inserted in the narrative at quite a late stage.¹⁷ The date and the setting of the Song, however, are variously estimated among scholars. McCarter, for instance, suggests a provisional dating to the ninth or late tenth century,¹⁸ whereas Aejmelaeus sees many Deuteronomistic features in the song.¹⁹ Regarding the composition history of the passage, Smith assumes that before the insertion of the Song, the text proceeded directly from “he is given to the Lord” to “so

¹⁵ The amount of empty space is uncertain due to a paragraph break before the Song of Hannah. DJD XVII, 32.

¹⁶ MSS O 29 318 read actually the aorist singular: κατέλειπεν. The aorist plural κατέλειπον is attested by A V 82-93 236*-242-313-530 b 56 527 55 158 245 460 707.

¹⁷ McCarter, *I Samuel*, 75; Smith, *Samuel*, 14; Driver, *Notes*, 23.

¹⁸ McCarter, *I Samuel*, 76.

¹⁹ A. Aejmelaeus, “Hannah’s Psalm” in J. Pakkala/M. Nissinen (ed.), *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 95; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 355–6.

she left him there and went to Ramah.”²⁰ McCarter, however, opts for the originality of the Qumran form of the text: “The presence of *šām* in MT indicates that the tradition behind it had some reference to the leaving of the child.” According to McCarter, verse 2:11 originally began with just the words “*wtlk hrmth* on the basis of LXX.”²¹

In the MT there seems to be a tendency to diminish the role of Hannah as a subject, especially in religious activities.²² Therefore the change from the feminine singular וְהַשְׁתַּחוּ (4QSam^a) to masculine singular וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ (only Elkanah; so Leningradensis and most of the Masoretic MSS) or plural וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ (both parents of Samuel; so a few Masoretic MSS, the majority of the LXX witnesses, Peshitta, and the Vulgate) is far more probable than vice versa. To be sure, the orthographic difference between וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ and וְהַשְׁתַּחוּ is very small, which makes unintentional change probable.

DJD XVII suggests that in 2:11 *L* (καὶ κατέλιπον αὐτὸν ἐνώπιον Κυρίου ἐκεῖ καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ Κυρίῳ) preserves an old reading identical with 4QSam^a in 1:28 (וְהַשְׁתַּחוּ לַיהוָה) to which has been added elements of the LXX from other recensions, notably the words ἐνώπιον Κυρίου. The conclusion is that *L* “retains the Proto-Lucianic stratum in 2:11. The displacement of the reading from before to after the hymn presumably belongs to the late Lucianic stratum.”²³

In Ulrich’s view there are three different text traditions – 4Q, the MT, and the OG – in this reading. Each of these inserts the Song of Hannah at a slightly different point in the narrative. There are, however, some agreements: 4QSam^a agrees with the MT and the recensional stratum of *L* against the LXX majority and the proto-Lucianic layer in placing וְהַשְׁתַּחוּ before the prayer. In the inclusion of וְהַשְׁתַּחוּ, on the other hand, 4QSam^a agrees with the LXX majority against the MT. Ulrich also assumes that if the inserted prayer and the words ἐνώπιον Κυρίου (which he considers a gloss) are removed, then 4QSam^a agrees with the proto-Lucianic reading against both the MT and the OG.²⁴

The question is, then, how closely *L* and 4QSam^a actually do agree in this instance. In *L* 158 318 554 the worshipping by Hannah and/or Elkanah is men-

²⁰ Smith, *Samuel*, 13.

²¹ McCarter, *I Samuel*, 58.

²² Aejmelaeus, “Corruption”. The tendency can be seen especially in verses 1:9 and 1:14 in which the MT omits the words “before the Lord” in connection with Hannah. Similar remarks, with perhaps a different emphasis, have been offered by J. Hutzli, *Die Erzählung von Hanna und Samuel: textkritische und literarische Analyse von 1. Samuel 1–2 unter Berücksichtigung des Kontextes* (ATANT 89; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2007), 145–6, 214–16, and D.W. Parry, “Hannah in the Presence of the Lord” in P. Hugo/A. Schenker (ed.), *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

²³ DJD XVII, 34.

²⁴ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 120–1. Cf., however, page 146: “In 1 S 1:28, conflation [of M and G in 4Q] is possible, but double haplography is perhaps more likely.” Perhaps somewhat similarly F.H. Polak, “Statistics and Textual Filiation: The Case of 4QSam^a/LXX (with a note on the text of the Pentateuch)”, in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 241, who gives the instance under “Complicated redactional phenomena”: “order of words: MT=Q, against LXX.”

tioned both before and after the Song of Hannah. Although the form of the text in *L* in 2:11 is quite close to the (partly reconstructed) reading of 4QSam^a in 1:28, there are clear differences. In addition to the plus of ἐνώπιον Κυρίου in *L*, in 4QSam^a the verbs are in the feminine singular whereas in the *L*-text the verbs are in the plural (with the exception of the first verb in 318 and the latter verb in 82). Thus the elements that seem to connect 4QSam^a and *L* – having “and (she) prayed” after “and (she) left him there” and “there” only once – do not necessarily point to a close connection between the two textual traditions. The Qumran form of the text is most likely a very late combination of the forms reflected in the MT and the LXX, and in the *L*-form there is a double intrusion of a (slightly corrupted?) Hexaplaric reading.

2:30 בִּי־מִכְבְּדִי אֶכְבֵּד לִי חֲלִילָהּ נְאֻם־יְהוָה וְעַתָּה καὶ νῦν φησιν κύριος Μηδαμῶς ἐμοί, ὅτι ἀλλ’ ἢ τοὺς δοξάζοντάς με δοξάσω

נְאֻם־יְהוָה] pr לִבִּי 4QSam^a

φησιν κύριος] pr οὐχ οὕτως *L* 158 318: cf. 4QSam^a

According to DJD XVII οὐχ οὕτως in *L* represents לִבִּי of 4QSam^a but through a misreading (לִא־בִי). The Lucianic reading is regarded as a proto-Lucianic plus (motivated by נְאֻם־יְהוָה לִבִּי at the beginning of the verse) that reflects “the (secondary) Palestinian reading of which 4QSam^a is witness.” According to the edition it is very unlikely that the rest of the LXX tradition had been corrected towards the MT.²⁵ Saley, too, accepts that *L* reflects the 4Q-reading (rating “5”), but, on the other hand, observes that οὐχ οὕτως is the only rendering for לִבִּי in the καίγε sections. *L* shares it four times out of the seven occurrences in Kings. Thus it is probably not necessary to suppose a misreading.²⁶

The line in question (C III, 29)²⁷ is very poorly preserved. The traces of letters cannot be distinguished in the photograph of the edition, but the photographs in the Dead Sea Scrolls CD²⁸ reveal that the reconstruction is far from certain. Firstly, the first letter of the supposed לִבִּי resembles the leg of a *lāmed*, but it reaches the bottom of the line, whereas a normal *lāmed* of the scroll extends only halfway. Secondly, the supposed *kāp* seems to be too small to resemble any visible letter in the scroll. Finally, the supposed *nûn* is very unlike the final *nûn* that the scroll regularly employs. The uncertainty of the reconstruction renders the case as doubtful.

²⁵ DJD XVII, 44.

²⁶ Saley, “Proto-Lucian”, 37–38.

²⁷ This is the form of reference recommended in SBLHS, 76: it means frag. c, col. III, line 29.

²⁸ T.H. Lim/P.S. Alexander, *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

2:36 כָּל־הַנוֹתָר בְּבֵיתְךָ ὁ περισσεύων ἐν οἴκῳ σου

ὁ περισσεύων] pr πᾶς A O L d⁻⁶⁸ 554 = MT 4QSam^a

This agreement is best explained as a Hexaplaric addition in the recensional layer of *L* (see p. 112).

5:9 אֹתוֹ וַיְהִי אֲחֵרֵי הַסִּבּוֹ וַיֵּלֶךְ καὶ ἐγενήθη μετὰ τὸ μετελθεῖν αὐτήν

אֹתוֹ וַיֵּלֶךְ] סָבוּ גָתָה 4QSam^a

αὐτήν] τὴν κιβωτὸν (+ τοῦ θῶ ιῆλ 460) πρὸς (εἰς 460) τοὺς (> 19 460) γεθθαίους (γέθ 19 460) *L* 318 460: cf. 4QSam^a

DJD XVII accepts the lack of the place name as the original reading in both Hebrew and Greek and explains גָתָה as an explicating plus reminiscent of the mentioning of Gath in 5:8. The instance is held to be a clear example of a proto-Lucianic reading surviving in *L*.²⁹ According to Ulrich the original Hebrew (as well as the LXX *Vorlage*) had only סָבוּ. This reading was first expanded with גָתָה, which the MT replaced with אֹתוֹ. This made it necessary to change the verb to *hip'il* and later to point it as a perfect plural (וַיֵּלֶךְ), another possibility being an infinitive construct with a third person singular suffix.³⁰ Following this, Ulrich concludes that the proto-Lucianic stratum in *L* corrects toward the “Palestinian” text preserved in 4QSam^a.³¹ Saley, however, notes that *L* explicates “the Gittites” in the following verse (the other witnesses read only “and they sent the ark of God”). The reading “to the Gittites” in verse 9 in *L* may be an example of the same tendency of adding explicating pluses, and therefore “it is possible that the readings of G^L and 4QSam^a... could have risen independently each of the other.”³² Aejmelaesus offers an altogether different explanation: the OG translation was μετὰ τὸ μετελθεῖν αὐτήν πρὸς Γέθ / τοὺς Γεθθαίους, in which the pronoun αὐτήν corresponded to the suffix in connection with the infinitive construct as in 4QSam^a (סָבוּ). The MT reading אֹתוֹ is a corruption from וַיֵּלֶךְ. The text form attested in B and the majority results from partial correction towards the MT text form and subsequently the pronoun

²⁹ DJD XVII, 50.

³⁰ I see no reason why the consonants could not be read this way, although this form of a geminate verb in *hip'il* is very rare. I found only one comparable example, וַיֵּבֶר from וָבֵר, in Job 29:3. The meaning “after they had brought” is suggested in Gesenius, §164d, and C. Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax* (Neukirchen: Erziehungsvereinis, 1956), §145bη.

³¹ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 95 (see also “Conclusion” on page 115). McCarter, *I Samuel*, 120, while agreeing with Ulrich on the origin of the reading אֹתוֹ, accepts the Qumran reading (including גָתָה) as original. Herbert, “4QSam^a and Its Relationship to the LXX: An Exploration in Stemmatalogical Analysis”, in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SBLSCS 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 46, explicitly agrees with him: “1 Sam 5:9 ... and 2 Sam 6:9 ... are particularly likely to represent MT secondary readings.” Polak, “Statistics”, 227, gives this as a “primary” reading in 4QSam^a under the category “Obvious mechanical variants.”

³² Saley, “Proto-Lucian”, 38. Rating “2.”

αὐτήν seems to correspond to אֹתוֹ. This would make the agreement between 4QSam^a and *L* an agreement in the original reading.³³

5:10 וַיִּשְׁלְחוּ אֶת־אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים עִקְרוֹן καὶ ἐξαποστέλλουσιν τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς Ἀσκαλῶνα

4QSam^a אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל [הָאֱלֹהִים]
 τοῦ θεοῦ] + Ἰσραήλ *L* 731 56 318 = 4QSam^a

While considering the possibility of a Hebraizing correction in the majority of the LXX MSS, DJD XVII suggests that the reading יִשְׂרָאֵל is a proto-Lucianic plus.³⁴ The epithets of God vary considerably, especially when connected to the ark.³⁵ Herbert, too, writes that the longer reading “seems to represent a natural secondary expansion ... The ark is mentioned twice more later in the verse, the former with the shorter phrase ... and the latter with the longer phrase ... [T]he reference in question could have been abbreviated to conform it to the former reference just as easily as lengthened to conform it to the latter reference.”³⁶ Therefore the case cannot be considered a striking agreement. Saley, however, ranks this agreement in his category “5.” This is based on the observation that in chapters 5–6 4QSam^a and *L* always agree in using the formula “the ark of the God of Israel” (4 times) or “the ark of the covenant of Yahweh/Lord, God of Israel” (once).³⁷ However, the issue appears to be more complex – this becomes evident when one compares all the appearances of ‘ark’ in 1 Samuel.

In chapters 3–5 the author seems to have the following tendencies: (1) He favors the expression “the ark of **God**” for the narrator (11 out of 13 times) and (2) “the ark of the **God of Israel**” when the Philistines are speaking (5 out of 5). (3) The usage varies between “the ark of **God**” and “the ark [of the covenant] of **Yahweh** [God of Israel]” in the mouth of the Israelites (both once). However, (4) in the frequently occurring command-execution scheme, the author prefers to recount the execution using the same expressions as was used in the command (4 out of 5 times). (5) In chapter 6, on the other hand, the author’s preferred usage changes to “the ark of Yahweh” regardless of the speaker (8 out of 9). These tendencies may be observed in the following table.

³³ Aejmelaesus, “The Septuagint of 1 Samuel”, 126 n. 20.

³⁴ DJD XVII, 50.

³⁵ In the MT in 1 Sam: אֲרוֹן אֱלֹהִים 3:3; אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים 4:13, 18, 19, 21, 22; 5:1, 5:2, 10 (bis); 14:18 (bis); אֲרוֹן אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל 5:7, 8 (bis), 10, 11; 6:3; אֲרוֹן יְהוָה 4:6, 5:3, 4; 6:1, 8, 11, 15, 18, 21; 7:1 (bis); אֲרוֹן בְּרִית 4:4; אֲרוֹן בְּרִית הָאֱלֹהִים 4:4.

³⁶ Herbert, “4QSam^a”, 46.

³⁷ Saley, “Proto-Lucian”, 38–9.

Forms of References to the Ark in 1 Samuel 3–5 in Connection with Different Speakers

	Narrator	<i>Narrator re-counting the execution of a command</i>	<i>Israelites</i>	<u>Philistines</u>	Comments
3:3	God				
4:3			<i>Yahweh</i>		Command: Let us bring the ark ... here from Shiloh
4:4a		<i>Yahweh</i>			Execution is re-counted in vss 4–6
4:4b		God ³⁸			
4:5, 6		<i>Yahweh</i>			
4:11, 13	God				
4:17			God		Avoiding change
4:18, 19, 21, 22; 5:1, 2	God				
5:3	Yahweh				Perhaps to make contrast between Yahweh and Dagon
5:4	Yahweh				Avoiding change
5:7, 5:8aα, 5:8aβ				<u>God of Israel</u>	Command: Let the ark ... be carried about unto Gath
5:8b		<i>God of Israel</i>			Execution
5:10a	God				Assuming that

³⁸ There are variant readings: עֲסֵאֲרוֹן בְּרִית הָאֱלֹהִים > 2 Mss ברית | 2 Mss יהוה [הא] | Ms. י"ה האל.

					the plus “of Israel” is secondary
5:10ba	God				
5:10bβ, 11a				<u>God of Israel</u>	
6:1	Yahweh				
6:2				Yahweh	Avoiding change
6:3				<u>God of Israel</u>	Returning to previous scheme
6:8, 11	Yahweh				
6:13					Just “ark”
6:15, 18, 19	Yahweh				
6:20					“Ark” not mentioned in the MT
6:21			Yahweh		Command: “The Philistines have returned the ark ... Come down and take it up to you.”
7:1a, b		<i>Yahweh</i>			Execution
7:2					Just “ark”
14:18a			God		
14:18b		<i>God</i>			

The scheme in chapters 3–5 makes good sense: the narrator has no need to remind the readers that the God the ark belongs to is the God *of Israel*, but it is

logical for the Philistines to speak of “the God of Israel”. The nearly complete change to “the ark of Yahweh” in chapter 6 may hint at different authorship.³⁹

Relying on these observations, in 5:10a the MT probably has the original Hebrew reading: the narrator saying “the ark of God”.⁴⁰ This is expanded in 4QSam^a to “the ark of the God of Israel” in conformation with the instances before and in order to have a fuller text. The short reading is very probably the original Greek reading too. The long reading is very likely a recensional Lucianic reading: The word *κιβωτός* is attested 40 times in 1 Samuel.⁴¹ Of these *L* goes together with *B* 25 times and has a Hexaplaric approximation 10 times. Of the remaining five instances, in four *L* shows a tendency to prefer the attribute *τοῦ θεοῦ*:

6:1 אֲרוֹן־יְהוָה הָאֵל *κιβωτός*] + *τοῦ* (>29) *θεοῦ* *V L* 29 55; + (*τοῦ* 125 *Compl*) *κυρίου* *A O d* 554 = *Compl*; + *PIPI* 731^{mg} (*sub ast*)

6:2 יְהוָה אֲרוֹן יְהוָה *τῆ* (> *B**) *κιβωτῶ* *κυρίου* (*pr τοῦ* *A* 488 68'-120 707 *Compl*) = *Compl*] + *τοῦ θεοῦ* *L CII a*; + *τοῦ θεοῦ* *Ἰσραήλ* *O*; > *V*

6:11 אֲרוֹן־יְהוָה אֲרוֹן־יְהוָה *τὴν* *κιβωτόν*] + *τοῦ θεοῦ* *L* 55 318; + *κυρίου* *A d* ⁻¹²⁵ 554 = *Compl*

7:2 הָאֵל אֲרוֹן הָאֵל *κιβωτός* = *Compl*] + *τοῦ θεοῦ* *L*

The one remaining instance is the present case (5:10a). In light of the observation that there is a strong tendency in the witnesses to expand the expression, it seems reasonable to suggest that the agreement with 4QSam^a might not be anything more than both witnesses sharing the same tendency independently.⁴²

³⁹ In Exodus the ark is first just *אֲרוֹן* (25:10, 14, 15, 16, 21) but from 25:22 till 31:7 the expression expands to *אֲרוֹן הָעֵדֻת* exclusively. From 35:12 both expressions are used. In Lev 16:2, Num 3:31, 10:35 just *אֲרוֹן*, Num 4:5, 7:89 *אֲרוֹן הָעֵדֻת*, but *אֲרוֹן בְּרִית־יְהוָה* Num 10:33, 14:44. The situation is quite the same in Deuteronomy: just *אֲרוֹן* 10:1, 2, 3, 5, but from then *אֲרוֹן בְּרִית־יְהוָה* (10:8, 31:9, 25, 26). In Joshua the usage varies most: *אֲרוֹן בְּרִית־יְהוָה* (3:3, 17; 4:7, 18; 6:8; 8:33), *אֲרוֹן הַבְּרִית* (3:6, 8, 11, 14; 4:9, 6:6), *אֲרוֹן יְהוָה* (3:13; 4:11, 6:6, 7, 11, 12, 13; 7:6), *אֲרוֹן יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם* (4:5), *אֲרוֹן* (with an article or a preposition) (3:15, 4:10, 6:4, 9; 8:33) and *אֲרוֹן הָעֵדֻת* (4:16). The only occurrence in Judges (20:27) reads *אֲרוֹן בְּרִית הָאֱלֹהִים*.

⁴⁰ To be sure, the narrator is recounting the actions of the Philistines and this could be a reason for the long form – from the Philistine’s point of view the ark is still the ark of “the God of Israel.”

⁴¹ The MT has no counterpart to the occurrences in 5:11b and 6:20. The number of occurrences of *אֲרוֹן*, however, is the same since the MT has the word twice in 14:18.

⁴² Kreuzer, however, offers a somewhat different insight of agreements between Qumran texts and *L* in the addition of clarifying words:

[T]he Qumran texts in general also show a phenomenon that at the very least is similar to one in the Lucianic text: in the so-called vulgar texts, or the texts labeled by Emanuel Tov as texts in “Qumran [scribal] practice”, one finds the addition of clarifying words, just as in the Lucianic text. Because in many instances such explaining words of the Antiochene text go [sic] match the Qumran text, it is highly probable, that this feature goes back to the Vorlage of the OG and is not the result of an (inconsistent!) Lucianic recension. (Kreuzer, “Translation”, 40.)

$\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (pr τοῦ 56) V $L^{-127} C' a 509 f_s^{(-92)}$ 29 71 158 244 245 318 460 707
 (= 4QSam^a)] > B 121 Aeth; + τοῦ (> O) θεοῦ A O 127 d 554 = MT

10:11 נבא עִם-נְבִיאִים וְהָיָה καὶ ἰδοὺ αὐτὸς ἐν μέσῳ τῶν προφητῶν

4QSam^a מַתְּ [גַּבְּא] [גַּבְּא] + προφητῶν A O L CI (731^c sub ast) 68'-74-106-120-134
55 158 318 554 = MT (cf. 4QSam^a)

DJD XVII maintains that the *L*-reading reflects the *hitpa* ‘*el* participle of the verb נָבֵא reconstructed in 4QSam^a and the Masoretic reading is erroneous (originating in a haplography of two consecutive letters *mēm*).⁴⁵ It is, however, obvious that the plus of προφητεύων may reflect the MT reading as well, and its attestation by the chief Hexaplaric witnesses strongly suggests that *L* shares here a Hexaplaric addition.

10:25 יתִּיב אֵשׁ תַּלְמִידָא וְאַחֲרָיו כֻּלָּם וְעָזְרוּ לְהוֹצִיאָהוּ מִן הַכְּסֶלֶת וְעָזְרוּ לְהוֹצִיאָהוּ מִן הַכְּסֶלֶת
καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν Σαμουηλ πάντα τὸν λαόν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ

$$\text{םַּעֲהָלָתְכֶם} + \text{וַיִּלְכוּ} \text{ 4QSam}^a$$

$$\alpha\pi\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu (\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu 82)] \alpha\pi\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu (\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu 93-127) L^{-82} 44\ 707 = 4\text{QSam}^a$$

When the people do something “each one to his something” the Hebrew verb is in the plural (10:11 is not an exception since the subject is **וַיֹּאמֶר הָעָם**:

To my mind, that it is possible to observe “a phenomenon that at the very least is similar” in both the “Qumran practice” and *L* suggests just the opposite: both textual traditions have a tendency (“inconsistent!”) to add clarifying words. It is most likely that they coincide now and then.

⁴³ DJD XVII, 56; similarly Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 64, 96, and in “Conclusion” on page 115. Polak, “Statistics”, 235: under “Slots longer / shorter.” McCarter, *I Samuel*, 131, suggests that the shortest reading represents the original Hebrew.

⁴⁴ Saley, "Greek Lucianic Doublets", 67, 72, suggests that the L-reading is Hexaplaric. "[T]he similarity of the \mathcal{G}^L reading to that of M could point to nothing more than Hexaplaric revision in \mathcal{G}^L " (p. 67).

⁴⁵ DJD XVII, 64.

אִישׁ אֶל־רַעְהוּ). The translator of 1 Samuel prefers to render the verb in the singular but the plural is always found as a variant: (plural underlined>)

4:10 וַיָּנֶסוּ אִישׁ לְאֹהֲלָיו καὶ ἔφυγεν (-γον M f 55 71 158 318 707) ἕκαστος εἰς σκῆνωμα αὐτοῦ

8:22 לָכֵן אִישׁ לָעִירֹו ἀποτρεχέτω (-τρεχε 127 242' 527 71; -τρεχετε L⁻¹²⁷ C',^{-242'} a⁻⁵²⁷ s⁽⁻⁹²⁾ 29 55 158 245 318) ἕκαστος εἰς τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ

10:11 וַיֹּאמֶר הָעָם אִישׁ אֶל־רַעְהוּ καὶ εἶπεν (εἶπον L⁻¹⁹ 44-107-125-610 f 29 55 71 158 245) ὁ λαὸς ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ

13:20 אִישׁ אֶת־מַחֲרֹשְׁתּוֹ כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים לָלֶטֶשׁ אִישׁ אֶת־מַחֲרֹשְׁתּוֹ καὶ κατέβαινον (-νεν O L CI 509 125 460 554) πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς γῆν ἄλλοφύλων χαλκεύειν ἕκαστος τὸ θέριστρον αὐτοῦ

14:34 אִישׁ אֶל־יָדָיו הִגִּישׁוּ אֶל־אִישׁ שׁוֹרֹו וְאִישׁ שִׁיָּהוּ וְשִׁחְטָתָם בָּזָה καὶ προσάγαγεῖν ἐνταῦθα ἕκαστος τὸν μόσχον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕκαστος τὸ πρόβατον αὐτοῦ καὶ σφαζέτω (= B V L 509 a f 29 55 71 245 318 707; -ετε L; σφαξατε Compl; σφαξατω rel) ἐπὶ τούτου

20:41 וַיִּשְׁקוּ אִישׁ אֶת־רַעְהוּ καὶ κατεφίλησεν (-σαν 44-107-125) ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ

30:22 וַיִּנְהֲגוּ וַיִּלְכוּ וַיִּתְּבוּ וַיִּתְּבוּ אֶת־אֲשֵׁיתוֹ אִישׁ ἕκαστος τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ ἀπαγέσθωσαν καὶ ἀποστρεφέντωνσαν (no variants for either verb)⁴⁶

If there was a plural verb as in 4QSam^a in the *Vorlage* (as is probable), it was still probably rendered with a singular verb in Greek. The *L*-reading is best explained as an inner-Greek change: a plural predicate for a collective subject.⁴⁷ A corruption from *epsilon* to *omikron* may also explain the variant. There is no significant agreement between 4QSam^a and *L*.

11:9 וַיֹּאמְרוּ לְמַלְאָכִים הַבָּאִים καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς ἀγγέλοις τοῖς ἐρχομένοις

[וַיֹּאמְרוּ] [וַיֹּאמַר שְׂאוֹל] 4QSam^a

εἶπεν] εἶπαν 245 = MT; + Σαούλ L 318 554

The right margin of the column (B X) is visible. The line length in the reconstruction of DJD XVII is quite even. Fincke reconstructs according to the

⁴⁶ 25:13 is a special case: David commands his men in the 2nd person plural: וְאַתְּחִירְבּוּ אִישׁ אֶת־חֲרָבּוֹ זָוָסְאֶשְׁתֵּי ἕκαστος τὴν ῥομφαίαν αὐτοῦ.

⁴⁷ The same happens in several *L*-MSS in 8:22, 10:11, and 14:34; in the other direction in 13:20 – unless the singular (O L CI 509 125 460 554) is original there.

MT (verb in plural and without שׂאוּל).⁴⁸ The following table compares the estimated line length in both of these reconstructions:

Table 3. Line Lengths in 4QSam^a B X in Reconstructions by DJD XVII and Fincke

Line	DJD XVII		Fincke	
	Letters and spaces	Millimetres	Letters and spaces	Millimetres
1	67	125.91	67	125.91
2	64	123.23	64	123.23
3	62	124.52	62	124.52
4	64	125.57	59	115.47
5	67	130.81	67	130.81
7 ⁴⁹	64	120.37	64	120.37
Average	64.67	125.07	63.83	123.39
Range	5.00	10.44	8.00	15.34
Average Deviation	1.56	2.36	2.22	3.70

In Fincke's reconstruction, line 4 would deviate 6.4% ($[123.39 - 115.47] / 123.39$) from the average, which corresponds to Herbert's 3% significance level in a section of an average width greater than 95.5 mm.⁵⁰ Thus a reconstruction without the reading שׂאוּל is somewhat improbable but not impossible.

14:32 לְהַשְׁכִּיחַ לְעַם הָעִיר (MT^Q) καὶ ἐκλίθη ὁ λαὸς εἰς τὰ σκυῶλα

לְהַשְׁכִּיחַ]]לע[4QSam^a
ἐκλίθη] ὥρμησεν *L d 318 554*^c
εἰς] ἐπὶ *L*

The original Hebrew reading is most probably ויעט העם על and the verb ויט (from נט, in this context, 'incline') reflected by the LXX majority reading ἐκλίθη is a corruption or an error (false translation) from it.⁵¹ As for the Hebrew variants, DJD XVII suspects a hearing error, interchange of 'ayin and 'ālep, which is held to be common in both 4QSam^a and the MT.⁵² Ulrich, however, goes much further. He points out that the original translator treats the Hebrew prepositions very freely in this passage, and therefore it is obvious that B preserves the original Greek reading (εἰς). Accordingly, he states that the *L*-

⁴⁸ Fincke, *Samuel*, 17.

⁴⁹ Line 6 has only three words because of a paragraph break.

⁵⁰ Herbert, *Reconstructing*, 82.

⁵¹ Somewhat similarly DJD XVII, 74.

⁵² DJD XVII, 74.

15:29 הוּא לֹא אָדָם כִּי לֹא אֱנוֹשׁ ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐστὶν τοῦ μετανοῆσαι αὐτός

Aejmelaeus points out that, since the plus is not attested in the MT, if Origen had known the text he probably set an obelos before the word αὐτός and this could have led to the omission of the whole sentence (as in *L* 44 La^M Tht). The same obelos could explain the minus of only the word αὐτός in V 245 707. The reading with just the word αὐτός witnesses both the presence of the longest reading in the OG as well as its partial omission by some early Jewish (non-Hexaplaric) Hebraizing corrector.⁵⁷ This means that the reading in *L* derives from the Hexapla (Aejmelaeus suggests that probably from some other than the LXX column⁵⁸) without connection to 4QSam^a. To omit a semantically very difficult clause fits well with the Lucianic recensional tendencies.

⁵⁸ Aejmelaesus, “Kingdom”, 362.

15:30 יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנָגַד זִקְנֵי־עַמִּי וְנָגַד בְּבִדְיָי עִתָּהּ אֲלָלָא δόξασον με δὴ ἐνώπιον
πρεσβυτέρων Ισραηλ καὶ ἐνώπιον λαοῦ μου

יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנָגַד זִקְנֵי־עַמִּי וְנָגַד זִקְנֵי עַם[י וְנָגַד יִשְׂרָאֵל] 4QSam^a
Ισραηλ καὶ ἐνώπιον λαοῦ (pr τοῦ 379-530 *a*⁻⁵²⁷ *f* 489) μου] λαοῦ (pr τοῦ *O*
L) μου καὶ ἐνώπιον Ισραηλ (pr τοῦ *L*) *A O L d* 554 = MT 4QSam^a

It is clear that 4QSam^a attests the same order of the expressions (“before the elders of my people and before Israel”) as the MT. DJD XVII suggests that the B-reading represents the OG and results from a misplacement of words by the translator and accepts the Masoretic reading as the original Hebrew.⁵⁹ Ulrich too accepts the B-reading as the original Greek text form, and the *L*-reading is a correction towards 4QSam^a.⁶⁰ While agreeing with DJD XVII and Ulrich that the B-reading represents the OG, the attestation of the *L*-reading by the chief Hexaplaric witnesses suggests that it is a Hexaplaric correction that Lucian accepted in his recension. Accordingly, no close affiliation between 4QSam^a and *L* should be assumed in this reading.

25:5 וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד לְנָעָרִים καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς παιδαρίοις

יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנָגַד זִקְנֵי־עַמִּי וְנָגַד זִקְנֵי עַם[י וְנָגַד יִשְׂרָאֵל] 4QSam^a
τοῖς παιδαρίοις] πρὸς τὰ παιδάρια *L*: cf. 4QSam^a; αὐτοῖς *O* 44-125

The prepositions אֶל and לְ are practically interchangeable. The translator of 1 Samuel has a tendency to prefer πρὸς for אֶל and dative for לְ, but is by no means slavish in this respect. The variation, however, does not seem to coincide with whether the verb אָמַר is used in the sense ‘say’ or ‘command’: no distinction is made according to the rank or status of the one addressed.⁶¹ Tak-

⁵⁹ DJD XVII, 77.

⁶⁰ Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 142–3. Ulrich, however, leaves open the option that the reading of *A O L* is Hexaplaric: “...pL then corrected toward 4Q, or G^h corrected toward M” (Ibid.).

⁶¹ The phenomenon can be illustrated by the following table of instances of this variation in chapters 9–15.

Some Renderings of אָמַר אֶל and אָמַר לְ in 1 Samuel 9–15

	‘command’	‘say’
אֶל πρὸς	9:3 Kish to Saul; 11:14 Samuel to the people; 14:6 Jonathan his armor-bearer; 14:19 Saul to the priest	10:11 the people one to another; 10:14 Saul’s uncle to Saul and the servant; 10:16 Saul to his uncle
אֶל dative	9:27 Samuel to Saul; 14:1 Jonathan to his armor-bearer; 14:40 Saul to the people	10:2 two men to Saul (in Samuel’s speech); 11:3 elders of Jabesh to Nahash
לְ πρὸς		9:10 Saul to his servant (command?)
לְ dative	9:5 Saul to his servant; 9:23 Samuel to the cook; 9:27 Saul to his servant (in Samuel’s command)	9:6 servant to Saul; 9:7 Saul to his servant; 9:11 Saul and servant to the girls; 14:7 armor-bearer to Jonathan

ing the variation into account, the agreement between 4QSam^a and *L* is reduced to only apparent.

25:9–10a בָּלַע וַיִּנְחֹחַ וַיַּעַן נָבָל ... וַיָּבֹאוּ נַעֲרֵי דָוִד ... καὶ ἔρχονται τὰ παιδάρια ... καὶ ἀνεπή-
δησεν καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Ναβαλ

וַיִּנְחֹחַ] בל[נ] ז[ח]פ[וי] 4QSam^a
ἀνεπήδησεν] + Ναβαλ *L* *d*⁻¹⁰⁶

DJD XVII notes that the rare word וַיִּנְחֹחַ is also found in 4QSam^b at 1 Sam 20:34,⁶² where, as here, the corresponding Greek expression is ἀνεπήδησεν (“jumped up with excitement” or “started up”). McCarter opts for the originality of the Qumran reading and explains the MT reading as a transcriptional error (confusion of *pē* and *nûn*, and *zayin* and *wāw*).⁶³ The possible proto-Lucianic feature is only the explication of the subject, which is undoubtedly Nabal in the Greek text form. In Greek this is best attributed to the Lucianic recensor: in the Lucianic text the predicate is often given in the singular if the subject is neuter plural⁶⁴ and ‘Nabal’ is added to guide the reader not to take παιδάρια as the subject. Note that in verse 10 Nabal is explicated in the reconstruction of DJD XVII (וַיַּעַן נָבָל), but not in *L*.

In the following variation units the agreement is based on an uncertain reconstruction – no analysis of these cases is in order:

2:23 אֶת־דְּבָרֵיכֶם רָעִים –] 4QSam^a; מדברי[ם בכם] καταλαλούμενα καθ’ (περι *f*)
ὕμῶν *L* *f* 318; ῥήματα πονηρά (> *O*) *A* *O*

2:34 fin] + [בחרב אנשים] 4QSam^a; + ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ ἀνδρῶν (> 554) *V* *L* 64’ 488
244^{mg} 318 554

4:10 יִשְׂרָאֵל Iσραηλ *A* *B* *O* *b* 68’-74-120-134] + [לפני הפלשתיים] 4QSam^a; +
ἐνώπιον (+τῶν *L* 530 44-106-107-125-610 460 318 554) ἀλλοφύλων *L* *rel*

6:7 – ἄνευ τῶν τέκνων] *pr* [עוללים] 4QSam^a; ἄνευ τῶν τετεγμένων (τέκνων
44-106-107-125-610 488 158 318) *L* 44-106-107-125-610 488 158 318

6:8 וְהָלַךְ καὶ ἀπελάσατε αὐτήν καὶ ἀπελεύσεται] + [הלכתם] 4QSam^a; καὶ
ἀπελεύσεται καὶ ἀπελεύσεσθε *L*⁻¹⁹ 554^{mg} (*vid*)

6:18 אֶבֶל לִיתֵּן] [האבן] 4QSam^a; *pr* τοῦ *L* *s*⁻⁶⁴ (*absc* 92) 244 460

⁶² DJD XVII, 87; for discussion of 20:34, see p. 233.

⁶³ McCarter, *I Samuel*, 393.

⁶⁴ E.g., the preceding verbs ἔρχονται and λαλοῦσιν are changed to ἔρχεται and λαλεῖ in *L*. Brock, *Recensions*, 248–9. Brock notes that the original usage of the translator of 1 Samuel is inconsistent when the subject consists of persons.

9:6 גְּדֹל וְנִכְבָּד [גדל ונכבד] 4QSam^a; pr μέγας καί (>55) *L* 55

9:6 שָׁם אֲוִלִי [נא אלי ו אולי] 4QSam^a; pr δὴ πρὸς αὐτόν *L* 318

9:11 וְהָמָּה וְהָמָּה וְהָמָּה [והנה המה] 4QSam^a; καὶ ἰδοὺ αὐτοί *L* 318 554; > 44-107-125-610

9:20 fin] + [עלה לפני] 4QSam^a; + ἀνάβηθι ἔμπροσθέν μου *L* f318: cf. v. 21

9:21 וּמִשְׁפָּחָתִי הַצֶּעֳרָה מִכָּל־מִשְׁפָּחוֹת שְׁבָטֵי [ומשפחה הצעירה מכול משפחות] 4QSam^a; ἡ πατριά μου ὀλιγοστή παρὰ (υπερ 82) πάσας πατριᾶς (pr τας 82) *L*

10:4 שְׁתֵּי־לֶחֶם דּוּם אֲפֶרֶחֶם אֲרָטֹן [ת]נופות לחם 4QSam^a; > דּוּם *L* (שתי would fit in the lacuna in 4QSam^a)

12:14 אֲלֵהֵיכֶם פֹּרֶעֻסִים [אלוהיכם והצלכם] 4QSam^a; Θεοῦ ὑμῶν καὶ ἐξελεῖται ὑμᾶς *L* 554^{mg}

15:27 וַיִּקְרַע וַיִּעְצֹר וַיִּקְרַע [ויעצר ויקרעהו] 4QSam^a; καὶ ἐπέσχευεν καὶ διέρρηξεν αὐτό *L* 158 554

20:38 אֲתִהְיֶה־עִיבָא תֶּסֶחֱזָא [את החץ ויביא] 4QSam^a; τὰς σχίζας καὶ ἤνεγκε *O* *L* 44-107-125-610 554

24:8 וַיֵּצֵא בְּדֶרֶךְ מִן־הַמֶּעֱרָה וַיֵּלֶךְ בְּדֶרֶךְ [יוצא בדרך מן המערה] 4QSam^a; καὶ ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν ἐκ τοῦ σπηλαίου *L*

24:9 וַיִּקָּם וַיֵּצֵא אֶת־אֲחֵרֵי־שָׂאֻל [ויצא] 4QSam^a; καὶ ἐξῆλθε *L* rel (*L*-reading probably the OG)

24:9 אַחֲרֵי־שָׂאֻל ... אַחֲרֵי־כֵן וַיֵּצֵא ... אַחֲרֵי־כֵן וַיֵּצֵא [אחרי ... אחרי שאול] 4QSam^a; ὀπίσω Σαούλ ... ὀπίσω Σαούλ *L* (19 absc) 158 554*

24:20 עָשִׂיתָהּ [עשיתה] 4QSam^a; pr σύ *V* *C'* *a* d^{-125} *f* *s* 29 55 71 158 244 245 318 460 342 554 707; + σύ L^{-108*}

25:8 וְלַעֲבָדִים לְבָנֶךָ דָּוִד [לעבדים לבנך דויד] 4QSam^a; τοῖς παισὶ τῷ σὺ τῷ σου Δαυίδ *O* *L* 318 554

25:20 וַיֵּצֵא אֶת־אֲחֵרֵי־שָׂאֻל [עולי] 4QSam^a; ἀνέβαινον *L*

31:1 וַיֵּצֵא אֶת־אֲחֵרֵי־שָׂאֻל [גלבע] 4QSam^a; > τῷ 247 *L* *b* 44-125 56 71 245 707

31:3 ויחלו אתו אל [καὶ ἐτραυματίσθη εἰς τὰ ὑποχόνδρια] [וַיַּחַל מֵאֵד מִהַמּוֹרִים 4QSam^a; καὶ ἐτραυμάτισαν αὐτὸν εἰς τὰ ὑποχόνδρια *L*⁻⁸²]

9.2.3 The Character of 4QSam^b

The fragments of the oldest Samuel scroll at Qumran are signified by 4QSam^b and date to approximately 250–225 BCE.⁶⁵ The editors call its orthography “surprisingly archaic.” Although Cross’s theory of the proto-Lucianic recension is based on 4QSam^a, in the edition, three readings are explicitly considered proto-Lucianic. For this reason it is justified to analyze the suggested agreements between 4QSam^b and *L*.

The editors of DJD XVII give the number of agreements between 4QSam^b and other witnesses in 1–2 Samuel in a table.⁶⁶ According to this table, the number of any kind of agreements between 4QSam^b and *L* against B or B and the MT is 27, of which 21 are based on reconstructions. For 1 Samuel there are three agreements that are not reconstructed and seven in uncertain reconstructions.

9.2.4 Suggested agreements between 4QSam^b and *L*

16:7 וְיִרְאֶה הָאָדָם [בִּן יִרְאֶה אֱלֹהִים] 4QSam^b + [הָאָדָם] + [בִּן יִרְאֶה אֱלֹהִים] 4QSam^b

ὄψεται] pr οὕτως (-τος 93) *L* 554^{mg}

According to DJD XVII, the phrase reflected in *L* (including בִּן for οὕτως) is needed to fill the lacuna in the line in 4QSam^b.⁶⁷ The reconstruction is quite reliable since the right margin is visible. According to the reconstruction and my estimations of the average letter and space widths (see Appendix B), the average line length in the section (frg. 4, lines 1–7) is 156.87 mm (range 11.43, standard deviation 4.30). The reading is on line 6, which is 151.02 mm in length (3.7% shorter than average), but without reading בִּן it would be 147.34 mm (–5.76%, which corresponds to a 4.3% probability). Moreover, DJD XVII states that the reading of the MT is impossible as it stands. If the Qumran reading is original, the omission of בִּן יִרְאֶה אֱלֹהִים in the MT could be explained by a parablepsis from בִּן to the following בִּי.⁶⁸ However, there is much confusion in

⁶⁵ 4QSam^c is not treated here because it only has the verses 1 Sam 25:30–2 and there are no suspected proto-Lucianic variation units in it in these verses.

⁶⁶ DJD XVII, 222.

⁶⁷ DJD XVII, 228.

⁶⁸ This is probably what Cross (DJD XVII, 228) suggests.

the Greek tradition in the whole sentence. The most probable explanation for the *L*-reading is that οὕτως is added to clarify the meaning (cf. also p. 121).

20:32 אֶלְיוּ וַיֹּאמֶר אָבִיו אֶת־שְׂאוּל וַיִּעַן יְהוֹנָתָן וַיֹּאמֶר אֶלְיוּ καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Ἰωναθάν τῷ Σαουλ

4QSam^b [את] אביו ויאמר [את־שְׂאוּל אביו ויאמר אֶלְיוּ]

τῷ Σαουλ B b] τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν V L CI-242 a 56 29 55 158 245 318 707; > 44-106-107-125-610 71; + καὶ εἶπεν CII⁻²⁴² 246 68'-74-120-134 s 244 460 554; + καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν O

According to my calculations, the average line length in the reconstruction of DJD XVII of fragments 6 and 7 is 98.65 letters and spaces⁶⁹ (range 13, standard deviation 4.27) or 166.20 mm (range 23.74, standard deviation 6.58). The line in question (6) is 174.00 mm (+4.69% from the average) in the reconstruction of DJD XVII; with שְׂאוּל it would be 183.33 mm (+9.95%) which could be expected only with a 1.4% probability. This makes the reconstruction fairly reliable. DJD XVII prefers the short reading of B and explains the reading of 4QSam^b and *L* as an explicating expansion, which is further expanded in the MT.⁷⁰

In the passage concerning the suppers of the full moon in Saul's house, when Saul or Jonathan says (or does) something to the other, the object of the action is expressed with the person's name in verses 20:27, 28, 30, 32. In verses 33 and 34, however, Saul is referred to as simply אביו, but in these instances Saul is not spoken to but the narrator just recounts Jonathan's thoughts and moods. To have only אביו in verse 32 (as 4QSam^b according to the reconstruction) seems to break the scheme. However, in chapter 20 the juxtaposition of the father and his son enhances the dramatics of the narrative: Jonathan's line is his last attempt to make his father listen to reason: "Why should he be put to death? What has he done?"

Accordingly, a good case could be made for the originality of the (partly reconstructed) form in 4QSam^b: וַיִּעַן יְהוֹנָתָן אֶת אָבִיו וַיֹּאמֶר. Let us suppose that was the form of the *Vorlage* of the LXX. In that case the reading καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Ἰωναθάν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν in V L CI-242 a 56 29 55 158 245 318 707 (a rather wide attestation) could well be the OG. In the MT the text has been expanded with שְׂאוּל and אֶלְיוּ. The Greek readings τῷ Σαουλ (B O CII⁻²⁴² b 246 68'-74-120-134 s 244 460 554) and πρὸς αὐτόν (O) may reflect these via an early Hebraizing (or, in the case of O, Hexaplaric) correction or be simply *ad sensum*. The omission of καὶ εἶπεν in B b is probably just an error. If this analysis is correct, 4QSam^b and *L* agree because 4QSam^b attests the same Hebrew reading as the *Vorlage* of the LXX, and *L* (together with several other textual traditions) attests the OG translation of it.

⁶⁹ Cross estimates the average line length as "between 95 and 100." DJD XVII, 220.

⁷⁰ DJD XVII, 233.

23:13 וְיִגְדֵּל הַגִּדְּ בִּינְמֹלֶט דָּוִד מִקְעִילָהּ καὶ τῷ Σαουλ ἀπηγγέλη ὅτι διασέσεται
Δαυιδ ἐκ Κεῖλα

וְיִגְדֵּל הַגִּדְּ ...] וְיִגְדֵּל הַגִּדְּ 4QSam^b; ܕܐܪܥܐ ܕܡܡܫܐ Pesh⁷¹
τῷ Σαουλ / ἀπηγγέλη] tr L 125: cf. 4QSam^b

The question is whether 4QSam^b and *L* attest the same word order (וְיִגְדֵּל הַגִּדְּ ἀπηγγέλη τῷ Σαουλ). The final *lāmed* of הַגִּדְּ in 4QSam^b is given as certain in the edition. It is located between fragments 12 and 17; the diagnostic hook of the letter is clear on fragment 12 but the remains of ink on fragment 17 in the supposed point of contact do not resemble the lower part of a *lāmed*: the upper blot of ink curves up on the right slightly more than a regular *lāmed* does. Moreover, near the bottom of the line there is a tiny vertical stroke that extends too low to be the leg of a *lāmed*. (This is best seen in the digital photographs but the stroke is visible even in Plate XXV of the edition.) The letter might be as well the *dālet* of the reconstructed וְיִגְדֵּל or וְיִגְדֵּל (MT). The hook of the *lāmed* on fragment 12 still probably belongs to the word הַגִּדְּ, but perhaps fragment 17 should be moved about 6 mm to the left to allow the space required by the word וְיִגְדֵּל. This renders the agreement as uncertain.

The following lists the variation units in which the agreement is based on an uncertain reconstruction.

16:9 שָׁמָּה Σαμα B 121 125] [שמעה] 4QSam^b; Σαμαά V L O C' a f s⁻¹³⁰ 29 55
71 158 244 318 460 554

20:28 – καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ] [אמר] 4QSam^b; > αὐτῷ *L*

20:28 דָּוִד נִשְׁאָל נִשְׁאָל פֶּאֶרְהִיטַי Δαυιδ] [נשאל] 4QSam^b; > Δαυיד *L*

20:28 – τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ πορευθῆναι] [עיר] 4QSam^b; τῆς πόλεως αὐτοῦ *L*

20:38 וַיָּבֵא – B*] [ויבא] 4QSam^b; + καὶ ἤνεγκε *L* rel

21:4(3) מִהֵּי שֶׁ עִסִּין B 247 82* 379* 46'-328-530 a 509 44-106-107-120-125-
610 707*] [שמ י] 4QSam^b; pr עִי *L* rel = Rahlfs

21:6(5) הַמִּינִי עֲחָדִים] [מאתם] 4QSam^b; pr ἀπὸ τῆς *L*

9.3 Conclusion

In order to demonstrate the existence of the proto-Lucianic recension using the Qumran material from 1 Samuel, one should find instances of indisputable

⁷¹ Cross's reconstruction of the underlying Hebrew of Peshitta: וְיִגְדֵּל הַגִּדְּ (vocalization mine).

agreement between 4QSam^{a/b} and *L* in secondary readings. No such case is found.

However, the analysis has revealed that in three instances 4QSam^{a/b} preserves the *Vorlage* of the LXX and *L* attests the OG reading against B:

5:9 וְהָאֱלֹהִים אֲבִיךָ 4QSam^a; τὴν κιβωτὸν (+ τοῦ θῦ ἱλ 460) πρὸς (εἰς 460) τοὺς (> 19 460) γεθθάιους (γέθ 19 460) *L* 318 460

6:20 הָאֱלֹהִים יְהוָה 4QSam^a; > B 121
Aeth; + τοῦ (> *O*) θεοῦ A *O* 127 *d* 554 = MT

20:32 אֲבִיךָ אֱלֹהִים 4QSam^b; τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν V *L* CI-242 *a* 56 29 55 158 245 318 707; > 44-106-107-125-610 71; + καὶ εἶπεν CII⁻²⁴² 246 *s* 68'-74-120-134 244 460 554; + καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν *O*

Two suggested agreements between 4QSam^a and *L* are only apparent:

14:32 אֶל (ἐκλήθη) εἰς]]ל[4QSam^a; (ὥρμησεν) ἐπὶ *L*

25:5 הָאֱלֹהִים יְהוָה 4QSam^a; πρὸς τὰ παιδάρια *L*; αὐτοῖς *O* 44-125

In five instances the agreement is coincidental:

1:28–2:1 4QSam^a [וְהָאֱלֹהִים יְהוָה] ... [וְהָאֱלֹהִים יְהוָה]
1:28 κυρίω] + καὶ προσεκύνησαν (-σεν V 98-379 488 29 158; + ἐκεῖ V 98-379-731^{mg} 488 29) τῷ κυρίῳ V *L* 98-379-731^{mg} 488 29 158 318 554 = MT;
+ καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ ἀννα *O*
2:11 κυρίου] + καὶ προσεκύνησαν (-σεν 82) τῷ κυρίῳ *L* 158 318 554

5:10 הָאֱלֹהִים יְהוָה 4QSam^a; + Ἰσραήλ *L* 731 56 318

10:25 – ἀπῆλθεν (ἦλθεν 82)] וילכו 4QSam^a; ἀπῆλθον (ἦλθον 93-127) *L*⁻⁸² 44 707

25:9 הָאֱלֹהִים יְהוָה 4QSam^a; + Ναβάλ *L* 44-107-125-610

16:7 – ὁψεται ὁ θεός] + [בן יראה אלהים] 4QSam^b; pr οὕτως (-τος 93) *L* 554^{mg} (4QSam^b might attest the original Hebrew reading)

In four instances Qumran reading (or a reading very close to it) is also found in the MT and its attestation by *L* is most likely due to inclusion of a Hexaplaric reading in the Lucianic recension:

2:36 כָּל-הַנוֹתָר הַזֶּה ὁ περισσεύων] pr πᾶς A O L d⁻⁶⁸ 554 = MT 4QSam^a

10:11 – נָבֵא [מת[נבא] 4QSam^a; προφητεύων A O L CI (731^c sub ast) 68'-74-106-120-134 55 158 318 554 = MT (4QSam^a)

15:29 הוּא לְהַנִּיחַ (= 4QSam^a) αὐτός A B O 121^{txt}-509 d⁻⁴⁴] > V L 44 245 707 Tert; + (αυτος 554) απειλησει και ουκ εμμενει V C' a f s 29 55 71 158 244 245 318 460 554 707

15:30 יִשְׂרָאֵל וְקִנְיָנֵי עַמִּי וְנָגֵד (=4QSam^a) Ισραηλ καὶ ἐνώπιον λαοῦ μου] λαοῦ (pr τοῦ O L) μου καὶ ἐνώπιον Ισραηλ (pr τοῦ L) A O L d 554 = MT 4QSam^a

Finally, there are three cases in which the Qumran reading is given as certain in DJD but is found uncertain on close inspection:

2:30 נִאֲמַר יְהוָה φησιν κύριος] pr לֹא 4QSam^a; pr οὐχ οὕτως L 158 318

11:9 וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵיπεν] [וַיֹּאמֶר שְׂאוּל] 4QSam^a; εἶπεν 245 = MT; + Σαούλ L 318 554

23:13 וְלִשְׂאוּל הָיָה τῷ Σαουλ / ἀπηγγέλη] ...] לְ[וַיֵּגְד לְשְׂאוּל] 4QSam^b; tr L 125

These conclusions run parallel with those of Saley: “[T]here is definitely a layer in 4QSam^a showing distinctive agreement with Greek proto-Lucianic readings, but it is a relatively thin layer!”⁷² I would not, however, speak of a ‘layer’ in 4QSam^a, but that the Lucianic text preserves some original readings in some instances in which 4QSam^{a/b} has the same reading as the *Vorlage* of the LXX. There is also the difference that, unlike Saley, I have admitted as evidence of a proto-Lucianic recension only those readings in L that are secondary. As I see it, however, the two studies agree in recognizing that the evidence does not allow supposing the existence of a proto-Lucianic recension as suggested by Cross.

⁷² Saley, “Proto-Lucian and 4QSam^a”, 45.

10 Text-historical Conclusions

The essential questions in this study have been: What is the nature of the Lucianic text? What is its relationship to the pre-Lucianic witnesses in 1 Samuel? How should the agreements between them be explained? In order to answer these questions all the pre-Lucianic witnesses in 1 Samuel attesting readings in agreement with *L* against B and/or the majority of the LXX MSS were subjected to a meticulous analysis.

Josephus' references to 1 Samuel were analyzed first (chapter 2). His agreements with *L* are few and are mostly only apparent or, at best, coincidental. That Josephus and *L* should coincide now and then is probably not due to a close text-historical relationship but rather to the fact that both aim at better Greek style; that these witnesses coincide from time to time in some lexical variants is just what can be expected. Josephus frequently utilizes his own chosen vocabulary and the Lucianic recension contains many lexical variants. In one case, however, Josephus and *L* may agree in preserving the original reading (16:18 ἐν/ἐκ Βηθλέεμ) with several other witnesses against the B-text.

Next, the quotations by four early church fathers, Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian, were analyzed. While all of these witnesses – unlike Josephus – provide exact quotations, all of them have to be used with utmost care: The well-known problems of using quotations as textual witnesses also pertain to these early Fathers. Moreover, the nature and quality of the translations of Hippolytus' and Irenaeus' texts have to be taken into account. In addition, for the Latin Fathers Tertullian and Cyprian the question had to be raised whether they quoted the LXX in an existing OL version or translated it into Latin themselves. In order to deal with these issues, the nature of each Father's quotations from 1 Samuel was analyzed in its entirety. After this, a set of important readings were subjected to thorough text-critical analyses. These readings included all the suggested agreements between the Father and *L* as well as several other readings that demonstrate the overall nature of the text used by the Father.

Hippolytus (chapter 3) is the most problematic of the four early Fathers. Since the original text of *De David et Goliath* is only attainable through Armenian extracts in a catena MS and a Georgian continuous text translated from Armenian, the exact Greek wording of Hippolytus' LXX text is extremely hard to establish. Moreover, the complex issues about the authorship and date make the sermon a very hazardous witness for the LXX text. Although most of the suggested agreements between Hippolytus and *L* are only apparent or coincidental, on two occasions Hippolytus and *L* appear to agree in preserving the original reading against B and most of the LXX MSS (the five imperfects in 17:35; 17:36).

Irenaeus (chapter 4) appears to be the most trustworthy textual witness of the four early church fathers included in this study. His quotations from 1 Samuel have survived only in the Latin and Armenian translations of *Against Heresies*, but the Latin translation of the work is fairly faithful. This holds true for the biblical quotations as well – apparently, no Latin Bible was consulted by the translator, and few traces of later intrusions are visible. In five readings (12:3, 4 twice, 5; 15:22) Irenaeus and *L* agree against B and all or most of the other witnesses in preserving the original text.

Tertullian (chapter 5) appears to have rendered his LXX quotations into Latin himself. In using Tertullian's quotations, however, it must be borne in mind that instead of directly quoting he frequently paraphrases the Bible text. Thus a peculiar reading in an otherwise exact quotation might be the author's own invention rather than a reading of a MS utilized by him. Tertullian agrees with *L* and the majority three times in preserving the original reading against B (2:8 twice, 15:11).

Like Tertullian, Cyprian (chapter 6) too appears to have used the LXX in its Greek form. In three instances his text and *L* agree in preserving the original reading (1:13, 2:35, 36).

Interestingly, both Tertullian and Cyprian attest some Hebraizing approximations with several MSS against B and once against *L* as well (Tertullian: 15:29; Cyprian: 2:25, 36; 21:5[4]). These approximations do not seem to be of Hexaplaric origin. The question is more likely one of early Hebraizing readings of the same tradition as the *καίγε* recension. It seems that corrections of the same kind can be found in B even outside the *καίγε* sections. These kinds of corrections – provided they are indeed very early – may well have ended up in the textual lines behind Tertullian's and Cyprian's Greek text as well as the Lucianic recension, coming to the latter possibly through Theodotion. While corrections of this kind are most often found in B, in these instances B happens to have avoided the corrections. This is not surprising in any way since in the non-*καίγε* sections the corrections are generally very sporadic.

A very short chapter was dedicated to Origen (chapter 7). Although a pre-Lucianic Father, Origen does not qualify as a proto-Lucianic witness: he quotes 1 Samuel in only one instance in those works in which he utilizes an unrevised LXX text. In that passage there are no striking agreements between Origen and *L*.

The difficulties relating to the use of the Old Latin as a pre-Lucianic witness were described in chapter 8. The most important OL witness for 1 Samuel, La¹¹⁵, was analyzed. More than one third of the suggested agreements between La¹¹⁵ and *L* were found apparent or coincidental. Most of the actual agreements are early variants that do not prove a close relationship between the two witnesses. However, in nine instances La¹¹⁵ and *L* agree against B in preserving the original reading – twice with only minimal other support (1:18, 9:27).

Finally, in chapter 9 the agreements between the Qumran Samuel MSS and *L* that have been used to advance the theory of the proto-Lucianic recension were analyzed. In order to demonstrate the existence of the proto-Lucianic

recension one should find instances of indisputable agreement between 4QSam^{a/b} and *L* in readings that are secondary from the Greek point of view. No such case can be found in the Qumran material in 1 Samuel. However, it appears that in three instances 4QSam^{a/b} preserves the *Vorlage* of the LXX and *L* attests the OG reading against B (5:9, 6:20, 20:32).

All in all, the number of suggested agreements between the pre-Lucianic witnesses and *L* is about 75 in Josephus, the early church fathers, and those Qumran readings that are not based on reconstructions. In addition, Voogd's list of suggested agreements between La¹¹⁵ and *L* contains 70 readings. Close analysis has shown that the proto-Lucianic problem in 1 Samuel finds a three-fold solution: 1. More than half of the suggested agreements are only apparent or, at best, coincidental. 2. Of the indisputable agreements nineteen are agreements in the original reading. 3. In about 20 instances there is an indisputable agreement in a secondary reading. These agreements are early variants; mostly minor stylistic or syntactical changes that happen all the time in the course of transmission. Four of the agreements, however, are in pre-Hexaplaric Hebraizing approximations that have found their way independently into the pre-Lucianic witnesses and the Lucianic recension.

I hope my study has demonstrated the value of the MS group *L* as a textual witness: under the recensional layer(s) there is an ancient text that preserves very old, even original readings that have not been preserved in B and most other witnesses. Such readings can be found, for instance, in cases in which *L* agrees with the early church fathers, especially Irenaeus. This also confirms the value of the early church fathers as textual witnesses.

Appendix A: Hippolytus' Quotations from 1 Samuel in *De David et Goliath*

Garitte's Latin translations of Hippolytus' text in Georgian or Armenian (or both) is given with the texts of Rahlfs and Ant in parallel columns. Garitte's footnotes are reproduced as they appear in the edition. The most obvious differences between the texts are in bold type.

1 Sam 16:1 (Rahlfs)	Hipp <i>Georg.</i> 4,4	1 Sam 16:1 (Ant)
καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς Σαμουήλ Ἔως πότε σὺ πενθεῖς ἐπὶ Σαουλ, κἀγὼ ἐξουδένωκα αὐτὸν μὴ βασιλεύειν ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ;	Propter hoc etiam Samueli Domi- nus mandabat et dicebat: « <i>Imple cornu istud tuum</i> <i>oleo,</i> <i>et emittam te</i> ¹ <i>in-Bethlehem</i> ² , <i>quia inveni</i> <i>inter filios Iesse</i> <i>(qui sit) mihi ut-rex»:</i> (ita) praevidit nobis ostendit (prae.) per prophetam de futuris.	καὶ εἶπε Κύριος πρὸς Σαμουήλ Ἔως πότε πενθεῖς σὺ ἐπὶ Σαουλ; κἀγὼ ἄπωσμαι αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ βασιλεύειν ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ. καὶ εἶπε Κύριος πρὸς Σαμουήλ Πλήσον τὸ κέρας σου ἐλαίου, καὶ δεῦρο , ἀποστείλω σε ἔως Βηθλέεμ πρὸς Ἰεσσαί , ὅτι ἐώρακα ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰεσσαί ἐμοὶ εἰς βασιλέα .
1 Sam 18:14 (Rahlfs)	Hipp <i>Georg.</i> 4,6	1 Sam 18:14 (Ant)
καὶ ἦν Δαυὶδ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ συνίων, καὶ κύριος μετ' αὐτοῦ.	Et selectus e corde Dei David sapientia caeli (fuit) adornatus; propter hoc etiam testificatur scriptura (<i>litt. liber</i>) et dicit: « <i>Et erat David</i> <i>intelligens</i> <i>super totum, et Dominus erat</i> <i>cum eo</i> ».	καὶ ἦν Δαυὶδ συνίων ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ Κύριος παντοκράτωρ μετ' αὐτοῦ.
1 Sam 17:1–3 (Rahlfs)	Hipp <i>Georg.</i> 6	Hipp <i>Arm.</i> § 39
		1 Sam 17:1–3 (Ant)

¹ te dimittam J.

² ad-Bethlehem J.

	Hoc ut viderunt alienigenae, concitati sunt; et ut viderunt potentiam eius, mirati sunt.		
1 καὶ συνάγουσιν ἁλλόφυλοι τὰς παρεμβολὰς αὐτῶν εἰς πόλεμον καὶ συνάγονται εἰς Σοκχωθ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ παρεμβάλλουσιν ἀνὰ μέσον Σοκχωθ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Ἀζηκα ἐν Εφερμεμ.	<i>Et congregaverunt castra sua ad-bellandum in Sochoth (sok'ot') Iudaeae, et in-pugnam-dispositi-sunt in-medio Sochoth (sok'ot') et Azek in-Caphar-naim (kap'arnaim).</i>	<i>Et congregati sunt alienigenae in bellum et castra-posuerunt in Sochoth (sok'ovt') Iudaeae;</i>	1 καὶ συνάγουσιν οἱ ἁλλόφυλοι τὰς παρεμβολὰς αὐτῶν εἰς πόλεμον καὶ συνάγονται εἰς Σοκχωθ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ παρεμβάλλουσιν ἀνὰ μέσον Σοκχωθ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Ἀζηκα ἐν Σαφερμίν.
2 καὶ Σαουλ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες Ἰσραὴλ συνάγονται καὶ παρεμβάλλουσιν ἐν τῇ κοιλάδι· αὐτοὶ παρατάσσονται εἰς πόλεμον ἐξ ἐναντίας ἁλλοφύλων.	<i>Et Saul et totus populus Israelis congregati sunt in-valle et praeparati sunt ad-bellandum adversus alienigenas;</i>	<i>et Israel congregatus est in valles et aciem-instruxit;</i>	2 καὶ Σαοὺλ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες Ἰσραὴλ συνήχθησαν καὶ παρενέβαλον ἐν τῇ κοιλάδι τῆς δρυὸς οὗτοι καὶ οὗτοι. καὶ παρατάσσονται εἰς πόλεμον ἐξ ἐναντίας τῶν ἁλλοφύλων.
3 καὶ ἁλλόφυλοι ἴστανται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους ἐνταῦθα, καὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἴσταται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους ἐνταῦθα, καὶ ὁ αὐλὼν ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν.	<i>et alienigenae steterunt in-monte ab-una-parte, et Israelitae steterunt in-monte ab-una-parte; et sinus unus erat in-medio eorum.</i>	<i>et alienigenae stabant ab hac parte, et Israel super montem ab hac parte, et vallis in medio eorum.</i>	3 καὶ οἱ ἁλλόφυλοι παρατάσσονται καὶ ἴστανται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους ἐντεῦθεν, καὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἴσταται ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους ἐντεῦθεν, καὶ ὁ αὐλὼν ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν.
1 Sam 17:4–11 (Rahlfs)	Hipp Georg. 6		1 Sam 17: 4–11 (Ant)
4 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἀνὴρ δυνατὸς ἐκ τῆς παρατάξεως τῶν ἁλλοφύλων, Γολιαθ ὄνομα αὐτῷ ἐκ Γεθ, ὕψος αὐτοῦ τεσσάρων	<i>Et constitit homo unus e gente alienigenarum, nomen dictum est ei Goliath (goliad) Gethensis (get'el³); altitudo eius quattuor</i>		4 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἀνὴρ δυνατὸς ἐκ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς παρατάξεως τῶν ἁλλοφύλων, Γολιάθ ἦν ὄνομα αὐτῷ, ἐκ Γέθ· ὕψος αὐτοῦ τεσσάρων

³ get'eli J.

πήχεων καὶ σπιθαμῆς·
 5 καὶ περικεφαλαία ἐπὶ
 τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ,
 καὶ θώρακα ἀλυσιδω-
 τὸν αὐτὸς ἐνδεδυκώς,
 καὶ ὁ σταθμὸς τοῦ
 θώρακος αὐτοῦ πέντε
 χιλιάδες σίκλων
 χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου·
 6 καὶ κνημίδες χαλκαῖ
 ἐπάνω τῶν σκελῶν
 αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀσπίς
 χαλκῇ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν
 ὤμων αὐτοῦ·
 7a καὶ ὁ κοντὸς τοῦ
 δόρατος αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ
 μέσακλον ὑφαινόν-
 των, καὶ ἡ λόγχη
 αὐτοῦ ἑξακοσίων
 σίκλων σιδήρου·

*cubita et palmus; cassis aeris*⁴
super caput eius; et in-lorica-
squamata eius humerale sicut
concatenatae (litt. *catenae* =
loricae-squamatae) *paenulae* (litt.
[vestimenti] impositi) *qua indutus*
*erat,*⁵ *et pondus* (litt. *statera*)
loricae-squamatae eius tria milia
*siclorum (sikla)*⁶ *aeris;*
et ocreae aeris
in-femoribus
eius, et clipeus
aeris in-humeris
eius,
et manubrium
hastae eius sicut
liciatorium textilis,
sescenta pondera ferri hastae
acies eius.

πήχων καὶ σπιθαμῆς,
 5 καὶ περικεφαλαία
 χαλκῇ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς
 αὐτοῦ, καὶ θώρακα ἀλυσι-
 δωτὸν αὐτὸς ἐνδεδυκώς.
 καὶ ἦν ὁ σταθμὸς τοῦ
 θώρακος αὐτοῦ πέντε
 χιλιάδες σίκλων
 χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου.
 6 καὶ αἱ κνημίδες αὐτοῦ
 χαλκαῖ αἱ ἐπὶ τῶν σκελῶν
 αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀσπίς
 χαλκῇ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν
 ὤμων αὐτοῦ,
 7a καὶ τὸ ξύλον τοῦ
 δόρατος αὐτοῦ ὡς
 ἀντίον ὑφαινόντων,
 καὶ ἡ λόγχη
 ἡ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἑξακοσίων
 σίκλων σιδήρου.

1 Sam 17:7b–11
 (Rahlfs)

Hipp Georg. 6

Hipp Arm. § 49

1 Sam 17:7b–11
 (Ant)

7b καὶ ὁ αἴρων
 τὰ ὅπλα αὐτοῦ
 προεπορεύετο
 αὐτοῦ.
 8 καὶ ἔστη καὶ
 ἀνεβόησεν εἰς
 τὴν παράταξιν
 Ἰσραὴλ καὶ εἶπεν
 αὐτοῖς Τί ἐκπο-
 ρεύεσθε παρα-
 τάξασθαι πολέ-
 μῳ ἐξ ἐναντίας
 ἡμῶν; οὐκ ἐγώ
 εἰμι ἀλλόφυλος
 καὶ ὑμεῖς Εβραῖ-
 οὶ τοῦ Σαουλ; ἐκ-
 λέξασθε ἑαυτοῖς
 ἄνδρα καὶ κατα-
 βήτω πρὸς με,

Et qui habebat in-
strumentum eius
ambulabat coram
eo,
et stetit et vocifera-
tus est (litt. *vocem*
fecit) *adversus*
castra Israelitarum
et dixit: «Quare
venitis
ad-bellandum
in-nos?
Nonne ego sum
alienigena,
et vos Hebraei
Saulis? Seligite
*vos*⁷ *hominem qui*
egrediatur in-me
 (litt. *mihi*);

Et Armiger
eius
ante eum ibat;
vociferatus est in
aciem
Israelis et ait
ad eos: «Cur
egredimini aciem-
struere
in bellum
adversus
nos? Nonne ego
alienigena sum
et vos Israelitae?
Eligite
vos
hominem unum, et

7b καὶ ὁ αἴρων
 τὰ ὅπλα αὐτοῦ
 προεπορεύετο
 αὐτοῦ ἔμπροσθεν.
 8 καὶ ἔστη καὶ
 ἐβόησεν εἰς
 τὴν παράταξιν
 Ἰσραὴλ καὶ εἶπεν
 αὐτοῖς Ἰνα τί
 ἐκπορεύεσθε
 παρατάξασθαι εἰς
 πόλεμον ἐξ ἐναντίας
 ἡμῶν; οὐκ ἐγώ
 εἰμι ἀλλόφυλος
 καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐβραῖοι
 τοῦ Σαούλ;
 ἐκλέξασθε ἑαυτοῖς
 ἄνδρα, καὶ καταβήτω
 πρὸς με.

⁴ T: 'bronze' (rvalisay), J: 'copper' (spilenjisay).

⁵ My translation of this difficult sentence is: "In his scaly leather cuirass [was?] a covering for the shoulders like the chainmail mantle in which he was dressed."

⁶ librarum (litra) J.

⁷ vobis J.

9 καὶ ἐὰν δυνη- θῇ πρὸς ἐμὲ πο- λεμῆσαι καὶ ἐὰν πατάξῃ με, καὶ ἐ- σόμεθα ὑμῖν εἰς δούλους, ἐὰν δὲ ἐγὼ δυνηθῶ καὶ πατάξω αὐτόν, ἔσεσθε ἡμῖν εἰς δούλους καὶ δουλεύσετε ἡμῖν. 10 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἀλλόφυλος Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ὠνεΐδισα τὴν παράταξιν Ἰσραὴλ σήμερον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ · δότε μοι ἄνδρα, καὶ μονομαχήσομεν ἀμφοτέρω. 11 καὶ ἤκουσεν Σαουλ καὶ πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ τὰ ῥήμα- τα τοῦ ἀλλοφύ- λου ταῦτα καὶ ἐξέστησαν καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα.	<i>et si erit,</i> <i>et vincet me,</i> <i>erimus</i> <i>vobis servi; et si</i> <i>ego vincam</i> <i>et occidam</i> <i>illum⁸ sitis</i> <i>vos nobis servi</i> <i>et servite</i> <i>nobis».</i> <i>Et eis dicebat alie-</i> <i>nigena: «Ecce ego</i> <i>convicior</i> <i>hodie</i> <i>vobis;</i> <i>nunc emittis</i> <i>hominem, et</i> <i>occuremus alter-</i> <i>alteri».</i> <i>Et audivit</i> <i>Saul et totus</i> <i>Israel verbum</i> <i>alienigenae,</i> <i>et timuerunt</i> <i>valde.</i>	<i>egrediat^{ur} ad me;</i> <i>si percusserit me,</i> <i>fiamus nos</i> <i>vobis in servos; si</i> <i>autem ego vicero,</i> <i>fietis vos nobis in</i> <i>servitute».</i> <i>Et ait</i> <i>alienigena:</i> <i>«Ego exprobrabo</i> <i>aciem</i> <i>Israelis hodie;</i> <i>date mihi hominem</i> <i>unum et singulare-</i> <i>certamen-inibimus</i> <i>ambo».</i>	9 καὶ ἐὰν δύνηται πολεμῆσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ πατάξῃ με, ἐσόμεθα ὑμῖν εἰς δούλους· ἐὰν δὲ ἐγὼ καταδυναστεύσω αὐτοῦ καὶ πατάξω αὐτόν, ἔσεσθε ἡμῖν εἰς δούλους καὶ δουλεύσετε ἡμῖν. 10 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἀλλόφυλος Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ὠνεΐδισα τὴν παράταξιν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ · δότε οὖν μοι ἄνδρα, καὶ μονομαχήσωμεν ἀμφοτέρω. 11 καὶ ἤκουσε Σαουλ καὶ πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ ἀλλοφύλου ταῦτα, καὶ ἐξέστησαν καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα.
1 Sam 17:4 (Rahlfs)	Hipp Georg. 7,4	Hipp Arm. 7,4	Cf. Hipp Georg. 6
4 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἄ- νὴρ δυνατὸς ἐκ (+ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ L) τῆς πα- ρατάξεως τῶν ἀλλοφύλων, Γο- λιαθ (+ ἦν L) ὄνομα αὐτῷ ἐκ Γεθ	Et quod dicit: «Egressus est homo unus potens e <i>castris</i> <i>alienigenarum,</i> <i>et nomen eius</i> <i>Goliath»,</i>	(et E) egrediebatur <i>homo potens ex</i> <i>acie</i> <i>alienigenarum, Goli-</i> <i>ath nomine (Arm^F;</i> <i>nomen eius Arm^E)</i>	<i>Et constitit homo</i> <i>unus e</i> <i>gente</i> <i>alienigenarum,</i> <i>nomen dictum est ei</i> <i>Goliath</i> <i>Gethensis</i>
1 Sam 17:8 (Rahlfs = Ant)	Hipp Georg. 7,5	Hipp Arm. 7,5	

⁸ Om. J.

οὐκ ἐγὼ εἰμι ἀλλόφυλος καὶ ὑμεῖς Εβραῖοι τοῦ Σαουλ;	Propter hoc cum-gloriatione dicit:« <i>Nonne ego sum alienigena unus, et vos Hebraei Saulis?</i> »	E: « <i>Ego sum alienigena et vos Hebraei</i> »	
1 Sam 17:5–6 (Rahlfs)	Hipp Georg. 7,10–11		
καὶ περικεφαλαία (+ χαλκῇ L) ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ θώρακα ἀλυσιδωτὸν αὐτὸς ἐνδεδυκώς, καὶ ὁ σταθμὸς τοῦ θώρακος αὐτοῦ πέντε χιλιάδες σίκλων χαλκοῦ καὶ ἰδήρου· καὶ κνημῖδες (+ αὐτοῦ L) χαλκαῖ ἐπάνω (αἱ ἐπὶ L) τῶν σκελῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀσπίς χαλκῇ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὤμων αὐτοῦ	Erat Goliathis cassis aeris ⁹ <i>in-capite eius</i> <i>et ocreae aeris</i> ¹⁰ <i>in-femoribus eius</i> --- Et quod dicit « <i>clipeus aeris</i> <i>in-humeris eius</i> » ...		
1 Sam 17:7 (Rahlfs)	Hipp Georg. 7,13	Cf. Hipp Georg. 6	
καὶ ἡ λόγχη αὐτοῦ (ἡ ἐπ’ αὐ- τῷ L 554) ἑξακοσίων σίκλων σιδήρου	Quia dicit « <i>sescenta pondera hastae acies eius</i> »	<i>sescenta pondera ferri hastae (> J) acies eius.</i>	
1 Sam 17:8, 10 (Rahlfs)	Hipp Georg. 8,1	Hipp Georg. 9,2	Cf. Hipp Georg. 6
8 Τί ἐκπορεύεσθε παρατάξασθαι πο- λέμῳ ἐξ ἐναντίας ἡμῶν; ... ἐκλέξασ- θε ἑαυτοῖς ἄνδρα καὶ καταβήτω πρὸς με, 10 ... δότε (+ οὗν L) μοι ἄνδρα, καὶ μονομαχήσομεν ἀμφοτέροι.	Hic proterviens corde et in-instrumentum suum sperans factus, constitit inter illos, clamorem fecit cum- protervitate et dixit: « <i>Emittite hominem qui egrediatur in-me</i> (litt. <i>mihi</i>) <i>ad-bellandum, et exibimus ambo</i> »	Et quia super omnes tyrannus erat diabo- lus et omnes facile subdebat et omnes vivos deglutiebat, propter hoc per- Goliathis os strepi- tabat et dicebat: « <i>Emittite hominem, et certabimus alter- in-alterum</i> » ¹¹	« <i>Quare venitis ad-bellandum in- nos? ... Seligite vos hominem qui egredi-atur in-me</i> (litt. <i>mihi</i>) ... nunc <i>emittis hominem, et occurremus alter- alteri</i> ».

⁹ T: 'bronze' (*rvalisay*), J: 'copper' (*spilenjisay*). Arm: aerea.

¹⁰ Arm: aereae.

¹¹ Although introduced as a direct quotation of Goliath's words (*et dixit/dicebat*), Hippolytus' quotations in 8,1 and 9,2 are paraphrastic combinations of three different sentences of Goliath's challenge as quoted in chapter 6 (given in bold in the right-most column). This is essentially the same phenomenon that C.D. Osburn defines as "conflation": "a form of adaptation in which a text is inserted within another text, more or less accurately." The instance at hand is not the only one of its kind in Hippolytus' Bible quotations; Osburn uses as an example of conflation Hippolytus' *Comm. Dan.* 3,2,4 in which the author deliberately combines 1 Cor 2:1 with v. 13. C. Osburn, "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism", *NovT* 47:4 (2005), 334.

1 Sam 17:32–33 (Rahlfs)	Hipp Georg. 10,1–2	1 Sam 17:32–33 (Ant)	
<p>32 καὶ εἶπεν Δαυιδ πρὸς Σαουλ Μὴ δὴ συμπεσέτω ἡ καρδία τοῦ κυρίου μου ἐπ’ αὐτόν· ὁ δοῦλός σου πορεύσεται καὶ πολεμήσει μετὰ τοῦ ἀλλοφύλου τούτου.</p> <p>33 καὶ εἶπεν Σαουλ πρὸς Δαυιδ Οὐ μὴ δυνήσῃ πορευθῆναι πρὸς τὸν ἀλλόφυλον τοῦ πολεμεῖν μετ’ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι παιδάριον εἶ σύ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνὴρ πολεμιστῆς ἐκ νεότητος αὐτοῦ.</p>	<p>Dixit beatus David Sauli: «<i>Ne paveat cor domini mei regis; exibit servus tuus et occurret alienigenae</i>». Hoc (<i>acc.</i>) nos edocet quod (<i>litt.</i> quia) a puero Davide vincetur omnino (<i>litt.</i> per omne) adversarius, et Saul homo timidus erat, quia hominum (res) cogitabat et verbi potentiam non intellexerat; propter quod¹² etiam ille ei dicebat: «<i>Non exhibis</i>¹³ <i>in alienigenam</i>;</p> <p><i>tu puer es, et ille homo pugnator a pueritia sua</i>». Cf. Georg. 10,4: «<i>Homo pugnator est a pueritia sua</i>» Cf. Arm. 10,4: «<i>Puer es tu, et (> F) ille homo bellator</i>»</p>	<p>32 καὶ εἶπε Δαυιδ πρὸς Σαούλ Μὴ συμπεσέτω ἡ καρδία τοῦ κυρίου μου ἐπ’ αὐτόν, ὅτι ὁ δοῦλός σου πορεύσεται καὶ πολεμήσει μετὰ τοῦ ἀλλοφύλου τούτου.</p> <p>33 καὶ εἶπε Σαούλ πρὸς Δαυιδ Οὐ μὴ δυνήσῃ πορευθῆναι πρὸς τὸν ἀλλόφυλον τοῦτον τοῦ πολεμῆσαι πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅτι σὺ παιδάριον εἶ, αὐτὸς δὲ ἀνὴρ ἐστι πολεμιστῆς ἐκ νεότητος αὐτοῦ.</p>	
1 Sam 17:34–36a (Rahlfs)	Hipp Georg. 11,1	Hipp Arm. 11,1	1 Sam 17:34–36a (Ant)
<p>34 καὶ εἶπεν Δαυιδ πρὸς Σαουλ Ποιμαίνων ἦν ὁ δοῦλός σου τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ, καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο ὁ λέων καὶ ἡ ἄρκος καὶ ἐ-</p>	<p>(Cum) audivit beatus David, non timuit nec pavuit¹⁴, sed ei dixit: «<i>Pascebat servus tuus</i>¹⁵ <i>oves patris sui, et erat, quando veniebat</i></p>	<p>Quod cum-audisset¹⁸ David, timuit cor eius, et ait David ad Saul: «<i>Pascebat servus tuus oves patris sui, et quando veniebat leo vel ursus et capiebat</i></p>	<p>34 καὶ εἶπε Δαυιδ πρὸς Σαούλ Ποιμαίνων ἦν ὁ δοῦλός σου ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο λέων ἡ ἄρκος καὶ ἐλάμβανε</p>

¹² propter quae J.¹³ The footnote reads: “Cum negatione *ver*, sensus est quasi non poteris exire.” (With the Georgian negation *ver* the sense is: “you cannot go”.)¹⁴ J add. cor eius.¹⁵ Om. T.¹⁸ cum-vidisset F.

<p>λάμβανεν πρόβα- τον ἐκ τῆς ἀγέλης, 35 καὶ ἐξεπορευό- μην ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπάταξα αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξέσπασα ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο ἐπ' ἐμέ, καὶ ἐκράτησα τοῦ φάρυγγος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπάταξα καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αὐτόν· 36a καὶ τὴν ἄρκον ἔτυπεν ὁ δοῦλός σου καὶ τὸν λέοντα,</p>	<p><i>leo vel ursus et abripiebat e grege, protinus- veniebam et eruebam (litt. proferebam) ex ore eius; et leonem et ur- sum occidebam ego servus tuus; et si in-me super- accedebat, verte- bam et attinge- bam¹⁶ guttur¹⁷ eius et confestim suf- focabam. (see above) [et leonem et ursum ccide- bam ego servus tuus]</i></p>	<p><i>ovem, egrediebar post eum et percutiebam eum, et eripiebam ex ore eius; et si surgebat super me, apprehendebam (eum) collo eius et occidebam eum; leonem et ursum evertebat servus tuus¹⁹».</i></p>	<p>πρόβατον ἐκ τῆς ἀγέλης, 35 καὶ ἐξηρχόμην κατόπισθεν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπάτασσαν αὐτόν καὶ ἐξέσπων ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο ἐπ' ἐμέ, ἐκράτουν τοῦ φάρυγγος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπάτασσαν αὐτόν καὶ ἐθανάτουν αὐτόν. 36a καὶ τὸν λέοντα καὶ τὴν ἄρκον ἔτυπεν ὁ δοῦλός σου,</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1 Sam 17:34–36a (Rahlfs) Hipp Georg. 11,1

1 Sam 17:34–36a (Ant)

<p>36b καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἀλλόφυλος ὁ ἀπερίτμητος ὡς ἐν τούτων· οὐχὶ πορεύσομαι καὶ πατάξω αὐτόν καὶ ἀφελῶ σήμερον ὄνειδος ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ; διότι τίς ὁ ἀπερίτμητος οὗτος ὃς ὠνείδισεν παράταξιν θεοῦ ζώντος; 37 κύριος, ὃς ἐξείλατό με ἐκ χειρὸς τοῦ λέοντος καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς τῆς ἄρκου, αὐτὸς</p>	<p><i>Nunc sit adnumeratus alie- nigena hic sicut unus ex illis. Et²⁰ nonne ego exibo et evertam eum et extermi- nabo hodie convicium inter Israel²¹? Aut quid, quis est alienigena hic incircumcised, qui conviciatur castris Dei viventis? Et Dominus, qui salvavit me ex ore leonis et e brachiis ursi, ille idem</i></p>	<p>36b καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἀλλόφυλος οὗτος ὁ ἀπερίτμητος ὡς ἐν τούτων· οὐχὶ πορεύσομαι καὶ πατάξω αὐτόν καὶ ἀφελῶ σήμερον ὄνειδος ἀπὸ Ἰσραήλ; διότι τίς ἐστίν ὁ ἀπερίτμητος οὗτος ὅτι ὠνείδισε παράταξιν θεοῦ ζώντος; 37 καὶ εἶπε Δαβὶδ Κύριος ὃς ἐξείλατό με ἐκ στόματος τοῦ λέοντος καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς τῆς ἄρκου, αὐτὸς</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

¹⁶ (manus) imponebam J.¹⁷ faucibus J.¹⁹ Om. F.²⁰ J add. nunc.²¹ ex Israel J.

ἐξελεῖται με ἐκ χειρὸς τοῦ ἄλλοφύλου τοῦ ἀπεριτμή-
του τούτου. καὶ εἶπεν Σα-
ουλ πρὸς Δαυὶδ Πορεύου,
καὶ ἔσται κύριος μετὰ σοῦ.

*salvabit me e manibus huius
alienigenae incircumcisi.»*
Et ei dixit Saul:
*«In-eum exi, et Dominus sit
tecum.»*

ἐξελεῖται με ἐκ χειρὸς τοῦ
ἄλλοφύλου τοῦ ἀπεριτμή-
του τούτου. καὶ εἶπε Σαοὺλ
πρὸς Δαυὶδ Πορεύου, καὶ
ἔσται ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ.

1 Sam 17:43 (Rahlfs) Hipp Georg. 13,1–2 Hipp Arm. § 84–86 1 Sam 17:43 (Ant)

43a καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄλλόφυλος πρὸς Δαυὶδ
᾿Ωσεὶ κύων ἐγὼ εἰμι, ὅτι σὺ ἔρχῃ ἐπ' ἐμέ
ἐν ῥάβδῳ καὶ λίθοις; καὶ εἶπεν Δα-
υὶδ Οὐχί, ἀλλ' ἢ χεὶρῳ κυνός. [43b see below]

Hoc ut vidit alienigena, dixit:
«*Canis nonne sum ego, quia ad-me
(litt. mihi) super-venis cum-baculo
et lapidibus?*

Et ait alienigena ad David:
«*Num canis sum, quod cum-baculo
et lapide venis super me?*»;
*ait David: «Ille etiam vilior quam
canis».*

43a καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄλλόφυλος πρὸς
Δαυὶδ Μὴ κύων εἰμι ἐγὼ, ὅτι
ἐξῆλθες ἐν ῥάβδῳ καὶ λίθοις ἐπ' ἐμέ;
[43b see below]

1 Sam 17:44 (Rahlfs) Hipp Georg. 13,1 1 Sam 17:44 (Ant)

44 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄλλόφυλος πρὸς Δαυὶδ Δεῦρο πρὸς με,
καὶ δώσω τὰς σάρκας σου τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
καὶ τοῖς κτήνεσιν τῆς γῆς. [43b καὶ κατηράσατο ὁ
ἄλλόφυλος τὸν Δαυὶδ ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς αὐτοῦ.]

*In-me (litt. mihi) exi, et dabo corpus tuum ut-
cibum volucris caeli»; et devovebat
alienigena Davidem diis suis.*

44 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄλλόφυλος πρὸς Δαυὶδ Δεῦρο πρὸς με,
καὶ δώσω τὰς σάρκας σου τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
καὶ τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς. [43b καὶ κατηράσατο ὁ
ἄλλόφυλος τὸν Δαυὶδ ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς αὐτοῦ.]

1 Sam 17:45–46 (Rahlfs) Hipp Georg. 13,2 Hipp Arm. 13,2 (§ 85–6) 1 Sam 17:45–46 (Ant)

45 καὶ εἶπεν Δαυὶδ πρὸς τὸν ἄλλόφυλον

Videsne quia manifestato corde confessus est Goliath, qui²² de se ipso dixit «*canis et immundus*». A quo David non timuit, a dicto verbo, neque ab instrumento nitido, nec quidem²³ a timenda altitudine; sed dixit illi: «*Tu*

(§ 85) Vides quod manifeste confessus est Goliath verbis, canem immundum se nominans. A quo David non timuit a minis, non a fulgore armorum neque a magnitudine staturae.
(§ 86) *Et ait David alienigenae: «Tu*

45 καὶ εἶπε Δαυὶδ πρὸς τὸν ἄλλόφυλον

²² quia J.

²³ Om. J.

Σὺ ἔρχῃ πρὸς με ἐν ρόμφαίᾳ καὶ ἐν δόρατι καὶ ἐν ἀσπίδι , κἀγὼ πορεύομαι πρὸς σὲ ἐν ὀνόματι	<i>in-me</i> (litt. <i>mihi</i>) <i>supervenis cum-</i> <i>gladio et hasta,</i> <i>et ego ad-te</i> (litt. <i>tibi</i>) <i>venio in no-</i> <i>mine</i> (litt. <i>per-</i> <i>nomen</i>) <i>Domini</i> <i>omnipotentis, e</i> <i>castris his Israe-</i> <i>litarum quibus</i> <i>conviciaris</i> <i>hodie;</i> <i>et te concludet</i> <i>Deus in-manibus</i> <i>meis,</i>	<i>venis super me</i> <i>cum-gladio et</i> <i>hasta, et ego</i> <i>venio super te</i> <i>per-nomen</i> <i>Domini</i> <i>potentiarum,</i> <i>exercitus Israelis;</i>	Σὺ ἔρχῃ πρὸς με ἐν ρόμφαίᾳ καὶ ἐν δόρατι καὶ ἐν ἀσπίδι , ἐγὼ δὲ ἔρχομαι πρὸς σε ἐν ὀνόματι
κυρίου σαβᾶωθ θεοῦ παρατάξεως Ἰσραήλ,			Κυρίου Σαβᾶωθ, θεοῦ παρατάξεως Ἰσραήλ,
ἦν ὠνείδισας σήμερον· 46 καὶ ἀποκλείσει σε κύριος σήμερον εἰς τὴν χεῖρά μου, καὶ ἀποκτε- νῶ σε καὶ ἀφελῶ τὴν κεφαλὴν σου ἀπὸ σοῦ		<i>et concludet te</i> <i>Dominus in ma-</i> <i>num meam, et oc-</i> <i>cidam te et capiam</i> <i>caput tuum a te».</i>	ἦν ὠνείδισας σήμερον. 46 καὶ συγκλείσει σε Κύριος σήμερον εἰς τὰς χεῖράς μου, καὶ ἀ- ποκτενῶ σε καὶ ἀφ- ελῶ τὴν κεφαλὴν σου ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ δώ-
καὶ δώσω τὰ κῶλά σου καὶ τὰ κῶλα παρεμβο- λῆς ἀλλοφύλων ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς, καὶ γνώσεται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ὅτι ἔστιν θεὸς ἐν Ἰσρα- ήλ·	<i>et dabo corpus</i> <i>tuum et corpus</i> <i>populi tui ut-</i> <i>cibum</i> <i>volucris caeli</i> <i>et bestiis terrae;</i> <i>et scient omnes</i> <i>quoniam est</i> <i>Deus inter</i> <i>Israel».</i>		σω τὰ κῶλά σου καὶ τὰ κῶλα τῆς παρεμ- βολῆς τῶν ἀλλοφύ- λων ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύ- τῃ τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοῖς θη- ρίοις τῆς γῆς. καὶ γνώσεται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ὅτι ἔστι θεὸς ἐν Ἰσραήλ.

1 Sam 17:49, 51, 53 (Rahlfs
= Ant)

Hipp Georg. 15,1, 3

Cf. Hipp Arm. § 89, 92, 94

49 καὶ ἐξέτεινεν Δαυιδ τὴν
χεῖρα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ κάδιον²⁴
καὶ ἔλαβεν ἐκεῖθεν λίθον ἓνα
καὶ ἐσφενδόνησεν καὶ ἐπά-
ταξεν **τὸν ἀλλόφυλον** ἐπὶ τὸ
μέτωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ διέδυ **ὁ**
λίθος διὰ τῆς περικεφαλαίας
(+αὐτοῦ **Ant**) εἰς τὸ μέτω-
πον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ
πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

51 καὶ ἔδραμεν Δαυιδ **καὶ ἐ-**
πέστη ἐπ' αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλαβεν
τὴν ρομφαίαν αὐτοῦ (+ **καὶ**

15,1 Appropinquavit,

amovit lapidem unum et
deposuit in-fundam, im-
pegit, et cecidit (litt. *de-*
dit in) *frontem eius et ef-*
fregit cassidem et incidit
in-cerebrum eius, et di-
rutus est (Goliath) *super*
vultum suum in-terram. -

15,3 Et stetit super
eum beatus David;
evellit gladium eius

§ 89 *et extendit David ma-*
num suam in peram
et cepit inde lapidem unum,
et funda-iecit et percussit-
frontem
alienigenae et ingressus est
lapis per cassidem
in frontem;
et cecidit super
vultum suum in terram.

§ 92 *Cucurrit David super*
eum et cepit
gladium eiusdem,

²⁴ Ant erroneously: *καδίον.

ἐξέσπασεν αὐτὴν ἐκ τοῦ κο- λεοῦ αὐτῆς Ant) καὶ ἐθανά- τωσεν αὐτόν καὶ ἀφείλεν (+ ἐν αὐτῇ Ant) τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. καὶ εἶδον οἱ ἀλλόφυ- λοι ὅτι τέθνηκεν ὁ δυνατὸς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔφυγον. ... 53 καὶ ἀνέστρεψαν ἄνδρες Ἰσραὴλ ἐκκλίνοντες (ἐκκαίοντες Ant) ²⁵ ὀπίσω τῶν ἀλλοφύλων καὶ κατεπάτουν (προενόμεισαν Ant) τὰς παρεμβολὰς αὐτῶν.	ipsius et ei conculcavit caput serpentis et de- monstravit suam poten- tiam super illum. Et illo tempore, <i>ut viderunt</i> <i>alienigenae heroem (litt.</i> <i>potentem) suum ever-</i> <i>sum, dispersi sunt hic</i> <i>illic; filii autem Israelis,</i> victores (facti) per Davidem, <i>conculcabant</i> <i>castra eorum</i>	<i>occidit</i> <i>eum, et praecidit</i> <i>caput</i> <i>eius. --- § 94 Ut viderunt</i> <i>alienigenae quia mortuus est</i> <i>dux eorum, fugerunt;</i> David autem et <i>filii Israel</i> <i>conculcabant</i> <i>castra eorum</i>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1 Sam 18:7 (Rahlfs)

Hipp Georg. 16,3

1 Sam 18:7 (Ant)

7 καὶ ἐξῆρχον
αἱ γυναῖκες
καὶ ἔλεγον Ἐπάταξεν
Σαουλ ἐν χιλιάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ
Δαυὶδ ἐν μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ.

Et ecclesia cum-hymnis
accrescit, et hymnum
cum glorificatione Deo²⁶
offert, quia dicit scriptu-
ra: «*Obviam-ibat citha-*
ra-canens Davidi,
et dicebant: Percussit
Saul mille et
David decem-milia».

7 καὶ ἐξῆρχον
αἱ γυναῖκες αἱ χορεύουσαι
καὶ ἔλεγον Ἐπάταξε
Σαοὺλ ἐν χιλιάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ
Δαυὶδ ἐν μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ.

The Armenian text (§ 89 and 91) clearly attests the secondary passages 17:48b and 17:50. For this reason Brock made no use of § 89 claiming that it is not part of Hippolytus' text, and § 91 is omitted from his discussion altogether.²⁷ Here the Armenian text is given in its entirety (excluding only § 93 which contains no reference to the text of 1 Samuel) compared with Rahlfs' text.

1 Sam 17:47a, 48–51, 53 (Rahlfs)

Hipp Arm. § 89–92, 94

47a καὶ γινώσεται πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία αὕτη ὅτι
οὐκ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ δόρατι
σώζει κύριος ...
48a καὶ ἀνέστη ὁ ἀλλόφυλος καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἰς
συνάντησιν Δαυὶδ.
[48b *O*: καὶ ἐτάχυνε δαδ καὶ ἔδραμεν εἰς
ἀπάντησιν τοῦ ἀλλοφύλου]²⁸
49 καὶ ἐξέτεινεν Δαυὶδ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ

89 Et David in corde suo precabatur
Deum, sciens quia non gladio et arcu
salvat Dominum sperantes in se.

Et appropinquavit David et cucurrit
adversus alienigenam in bellum;
et extendit David manum suam in peram

²⁵ The reading is not found in the MSS; the apparatus of Ant states that it is a conjecture for ἐκκλίνοντες proposed by P.W. Skehan, "Turning or Burning? 1 Sam 17:53 LXX", *CBQ* 38 (1976): 193–5.

²⁶ ad Deum J.

²⁷ Brock, *Recensions*, 199.

²⁸ 17:48b is not present in B V 243^{txt} a b f s⁻³¹⁴ 29 71 244 245 460 707 and it is asterisked in 127 243^{mg}.

κάδιον καὶ ἔλαβεν ἐκεῖθεν λίθον ἓνα καὶ ἔσφενδόνησεν καὶ ἐπάταξεν τὸν ἀλλόφυλον ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ διέδυ ὁ λίθος διὰ τῆς περικεφαλαίας εἰς τὸ μέτωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

[50 O: καὶ ἐκραταιώθη Δαυὶδ ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀλλόφυλον ἐν τῇ σφενδόνῃ καὶ ἐν τῷ λίθῳ καὶ ἐπάταξε τὸν ἀλλόφυλον καὶ ἐθανάτωσεν αὐτόν καὶ ῥομφαία οὐκ ἦν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ]²⁹
51 καὶ ἔδραμεν Δαυὶδ καὶ ἐπέστη ἐπ' αὐτόν καὶ ἔλαβεν τὴν ῥομφαίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐθανάτωσεν αὐτόν καὶ ἀφεῖλεν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. καὶ εἶδον οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι ὅτι τέθνηκεν ὁ δυνατὸς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔφυγον. ---
53 καὶ ἀνέστρεψαν ἄνδρες Ἰσραὴλ ἐκκλίνοντες ὀπίσω τῶν ἀλλοφύλων καὶ κατεπάτουν τὰς παρεμβολὰς αὐτῶν.

et cepit inde lapidem unum, et funda-iecit et percussit frontem alienigenae et ingressus est lapis per cassidem in frontem; et

cecidit super vultum suum in terram.
90 O dilecti, mirabile quiddam factum est. Decebat Goliath supinum cadere a strepitu lapidis, et Goliath in vultum cadens in terram adoravit Verbum Dei qui erat cum David; quod potentia Dei invincibilis est per-hoc appareat.

91 *Et potens-fuit David plus quam alienigena funda et lapide,*

et gladium non habebat in manu sua.

92 *Cucurrit David super eum et cepit gladium eiusdem, occidit eum, et praecidit caput eius.* ---

94 *Ut viderunt alienigenae quia mortuus est dux eorum, fugerunt; David autem et filii Israel*

*conculcabant castra eorum, sicut et Christus ait: «Dedi vobis potestatem conculcare Satanam et omnem potentiam eius».*³⁰

There are considerable differences between *Georg.* and *Arm.* in this passage. However, much of *Arm.* § 89–94 corresponds to *Georg.* 15,1–2, as can be seen in the following table (points of contact in bold; the Latin texts are followed by my own translation of them):

Hipp *Arm.* § 89–94

Hipp *Georg.* 15,1–3

89 **Et David in corde suo precabatur Deum, sciens quia non gladio** et arcu **salvat Dominum** [*sic*] sperantes in se. *Et appropinquavit David et cucurrit adversus alienigenam in bellum; et extendit David manum suam in peram et cepit inde lapidem unum, et funda-iecit et percussit frontem alienigenae et ingressus est lapis per cassidem in frontem; et cecidit super vultum suum in terram.*

15,1 **Et David in-corde suo ad Deum orabat;** Goliath autem instrumento gloriabatur; **sciebat David quia non per-gladium** et hastam **salvabit (salvat J) Dominus** servos suos. **Appropinquavit,** amovit **lapidem unum** et deposuit in-fundam, impegit, **et cecidit (litt. dedit in) frontem eius et effregit cassidem et incidit** in-cerebrum eius, **et dirutus est (Goliath) super vultum suum in-terram.**

²⁹ 17:50 is not present in B V 243 a b f s^{-314.488mg} 29 71 244 245 318 460 707 and asterisked in 127.

³⁰ The passage under analysis is stopped here because the following words in § 95 *Et David tulit caput Goliath in castra Israel* (cf. 1 Sam 17:54a) are most likely not a direct quotation. Paragraph § 96 contains no reference to 1 Samuel, and according to Garitte, “Fragments”, 282, paragraphs § 97–9 are to be attributed to Ephraim and not to Hippolytus.

90 **O dilecti, mirabile** quiddam factum est. **Decebat Goliath supinum cadere a strepitu lapidis**, et **Goliath in vultum** cadens in terram **adoravit Verbum Dei qui erat cum David; quod** potentia Dei invincibilis est per-hoc appareat. ---

92 *Cucurrit David super eum et cepit gladium eiusdem, occidit eum, et praecidit caput eius.* ---

[93] Christus ... per-mortem vicit mortem et vitam in homines scaturire-fecit et per-crucem **confregit caput dragonis**.

94 *Ut viderunt alienigenae quia mortuus est dux eorum, fugerunt;* David autem et *fili Israel conculcabant castra eorum*, sicut et Christus ait: *«Dedi vobis potestatem conculcare Satanam et omnem potentiam eius».*

89 And David called upon God in his heart knowing that the Lord does not save those who put their hope in him by the sword and the bow. And David *approached and ran in the fight against the allophyle; and David stretched out his hand in the bag and took a stone from it, and threw it with a sling and struck the forehead of the allophyle. And the stone entered through the helmet in the forehead; and he fell to the ground on his face.*

90 O the chosen, a kind of miracle did happen. It was fitting for Goliath to fall backwards by a clash/noise of a stone,

and Goliath falling on his face to the ground did honor the Word of God who was with David;

15,2 **Mirabilia sunt, dilecti**, praeterita mysteria (*litt.* consilia). **Decebat Goliath** per-vulnus corruere, (et) **per-strepitum lapidis** (*litt.* e lapide) **supinum corruere**; sed quia spirituale erat (id quod) futurum (erat), et non humanum, (hoc factum est) ut potentia Dei in hoc etiam appareret, et vulneratus Goliath eversus est (evertetur J) **super vultum suum, ut adoraret victorem verbum Dei quod erat cum Davide, quod** vincere nemo potest (*litt.* potens est).

15,3 Et stetit **super eum** beatus David; **evellit gladium eius ipsius**

et ei **conculcavit caput serpentis** et demonstravit suam potentiam super illum. Et illo tempore, **ut viderunt alienigenae heroem** (*litt.* potentem) **suum eversum, dispersi sunt hic illic; filii autem Israelis**, victores (facti) per Davidem, **conculcabant castra eorum, sicut fuit dictum a Deo: «Ecce vobis dedi potestatem** (*litt.* **dominatum**) **ad-conculcandos serpentes et scorpiones et diabolum et omnes potentias eius»**

15,1 And David prayed God in his heart; but Goliath boasted with his gear; **David knew that the Lord will (does J) not save his servants by the sword and the spear.** He approached,

took out a stone

and posited it in a **sling**, thrust at, *and it fell in his forehead and it broke the helmet and reached his brain, and (Goliath) was overthrown to the ground on his face.*

15,2 The past mysteries, O the chosen, are **miraculous. It was fitting for Goliath** to tumble upon his face, (and) **by a clash/noise of a stone** tumble backwards. But even because it was spiritual (which was) bound to happen, and not human, (this did happen) in order that the power of God would still appear, and **Goliath wounded was (will be J) turned upside down to honor the victorious word of God which was with David, which**

through this it appeared that it [Word] is the might of the invincible God. ---
 92 **David** ran over him and took his sword, killed him, and cut off his head. ---
 [93] Christ ... by death defeated death and made life abound among the people and by the cross **he crushed the head of the dragon**.
 94 As **the allophyles** saw that their leader was dead, they fled;
 But David and **the sons of Israel** trod under their feet their camp, as also Christ says: "**I have given you power to tread Satan and all his might.**"

nobody can defeat.

15,3 And the blessed **David** stood over him; and he plucked out the **sword** of the same and by it **he trod under his feet the head of the serpent** and demonstrated his might over him.
 And at that moment, **when the allophyles saw that their** mighty one had fallen, they were dispersed from there; but **the sons of Israel** who were (made) victorious by David, **trod under their feet their camp**, as it was said by God: "**Behold, to you I have given the power to tread serpents and scorpions and the devil and all his might.**"

These are clearly two versions of one and the same text rather than two separate compositions. It seems most likely that *Georg.* is closer to what Hippolytus actually wrote. Since *Arm.* is a catena MS it treats the text rather as a commentary than a sermon and not only abridges its source somewhat but also adds direct quotations (as is done in § 89, 91) or replaces an original paraphrase by them (§ 92, 94; cf. *Georg.* 15,3).³¹

What follows is a concise list of readings that are either special readings by Hippolytus or the Georgian and Armenian translators, or the agreement with some Greek traditions is only apparent or coincidental. In the latter type of readings often a short comment on the reading is provided.

16:1 σου] *istud tuum* Hipp *Georg.* 4,4
 δεῦρο] > Hipp *Georg.* 4,4
 πρὸς Ἰησοῦ] > Hipp *Georg.* 4,4; tr post Βηθλεεμ *L*

16:1 ἕως εἰς] > ἕως *d* 554 Ge?; > εἰς *A L CII* 799 *b* 246 *s* 244 245 460 707 = Sixt; in Hipp *Georg.*^T 4,4; ad Hipp *Georg.*^J 4,4

In Hippolytus' text, the T-reading might reflect the omission of ἕως in *d* 554, while the J-reading could be seen as corresponding to the omission of εἰς in *L* and a substantial part of the MSS.

16:1 αὐτοῦ] Ἰησοῦ *L* Hipp *Georg.* 4,4 (*Iesse*)

If the omission of πρὸς Ἰησοῦ above is freedom of quotation – as the lack of any MS support suggests – the name of the father needs to be mentioned in the clause “among the sons of Jesse.” Therefore the agreement between Hippolytus and *L* is very likely coincidental.

³¹ This is in accordance with Garitte's observations that were referred to on p. 35.

16:1 βασιλεύειν A B O b d 244* 460 554] βασιλέα 92 707 = Ald Sixt; εἰς βασιλέα rel Ge Hipp Georg. 4,4 (*ut-rex*)

The word 'king' (*mep'ed*) in *Georg.* is in the adverbial case, a construction that corresponds quite well to the majority reading εἰς βασιλέα. The majority reading, in turn, is in all likelihood a Hebraizing correction.

17:7 ἡ λόγχη αὐτοῦ (ἡ ἐπ' αὐτῷ L 554)] *hastae* (> *Georg.*^J 6) *acies eius* (et tr post σιδήρου) Hipp Georg. 6 7,13: cf. MT
 σίκλων Ge^{BJ}] *pondera* Hipp Georg. 6 7,13 (*sasts'or* = Ge^{SFO})
 σιδήρου] > Ge^{DOSJ} Hipp Georg. 7,13

Instead of the Greek loanwords *sik'la* (T) and *lit'ra* (J) used in verse 5, the Georgian word for σίκλων in verse 7 is *sasts'or* 'scales'. This variation is probably brought about by the Georgian translator rather than Hippolytus – the same variation is present in the Georgian Bible. The omission of σιδήρου in 7,13 is best attributed to Hippolytus' quoting technique. Regarding the reading *hastae acies eius*, it seems that Hippolytus attests αὐτοῦ with the B-text, but apparently takes Goliath and not 'spear' as the antecedent.³² That probably explains the need to explicate 'spear' (*hasta*) (which MS J, however, omits in chapter 6). There seems not to be a reason for the transposition of the expressions "sixty shekels of iron" and "its [spear]head" in Hippolytus' quotation, but it hardly goes back to any Greek MS tradition.

17:8 ἀλλόφυλος Hipp Georg. 6 Arm. 7,5] + unus Hipp Georg. 7,5

17:10 σήμερον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ] > σήμερον L C' *a f s* 29 55 71 158 245 318 460; *hodie* Hipp Georg. 6 Arm. § 49 (only one element)

For a fuller analysis of the phenomenon of the word σήμερον preceding ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ see p. 77. The pleonastic expression is limited to only a few cases in Septuagintal Greek and would be inappropriate in Georgian or Armenian. Therefore it is without consequence that Hippolytus and *L* agree in having only one element to express "today".

17:32 ὁ δοῦλός σου / πορεύσεται] tr Hipp Georg. 10,1
 πολεμήσει μετά] *occurrent* Hipp Georg. 10,1
 τούτου] > Hipp Georg. 10,1

17:32 δῆ] > O L 509 158 245 Chr Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1 7 Ge^{DOSJL} Hipp Georg. 10,1 = MT

³² Similarly NETS: "and his spear weighed six hundred shekels or iron." Cf. Brenton: "and the spear's head was formed of six hundred shekels of iron" (emphasis his).

In Greek, the omission of δῆ is very probably Hexaplaric. In Georgian there are particles that could be used as renderings of δῆ, but they are not used systematically in the Georgian Bible. The same very likely holds true for Hipp *Georg.* as well.

17:32 τοῦ κυρίου (*regis* Ge^{Lp}) μου] + *regis* Hipp *Georg.* 10,1 Ge^{DOS}

In all likelihood, the word “king,” found also in two Coptic MSS,³³ is an addition by Christian quoters and/or translators to whom κύριος without qualifications was preferably used of God or Christ.

17:33 δυνήση] > Hipp *Georg.* 10,2

As Garitte's footnote (see n. 13) explains, the aspect “you *cannot* go” is included in the negation *ver* which makes an equivalent for δυνήση unnecessary.

17:33 πρὸς] *in* Hipp *Georg.* 10,2

In Hipp *Georg.* the verb corresponding to πορευθῆναι is *ganukde* ‘go out; come forth.’ It is construed with a locative dative, which indicates here movement towards the Philistine and may include an idea of hostility. The locative dative is reflected in Garitte's *in* + acc., which formally corresponds not that well to Greek πρὸς. However, there is no reason whatsoever to suspect any other Greek reading behind the Georgian construction.

17:33 τοῦ πολεμεῖν μετ' αὐτοῦ (*L* slightly differently)] > Ge^L Hipp *Georg.* 10,2

The omission of τοῦ πολεμεῖν μετ' αὐτοῦ is probably Hippolytus' adaptation: the parallelism between verses 32 (“your servant will go and attack the allophyle”) and 33 is produced already by “you cannot go against the allophyle” – there is no need to repeat the attacking motive.

17:33 ὅτι] > Chr *Hom.* 2 *Cor.* 11:1 7 Hipp *Georg.* 10,2

The conjunction is left out for stylistic reasons both in Hippolytus' and Chrysostom's texts.

17:36 ὁ ἀλλόφυλος] + οὗτος *L* 530 125 158 554 Ge^{DOSL} Chr *Hom.* 2 *Cor.* 11:1 7 Hipp *Georg.* 11,1 (add οὗτος post ἀπερίτμητος *V* 376 Ge^J = MT)

³³ According to the collations of the Sahidic and Bohairic versions made by Elina Perttilä for Aeime-laeus' edition project.

The plus οὗτος in the LXX MSS is most likely Hexaplaric, reflecting הַזֶּה after לְהַזְכִּיר in the MT. Later in the verse there is a plus in the LXX (הַיְּהוָה כִּי דִּיּוֹתִי תִּשְׁמַח וְהָיָה לְךָ שִׂמְחָה) in which οὗτος is attested by all MSS and Hippolytus as well. Thus Hippolytus or the Georgian translator may get the pronoun from there without connection with any Greek tradition.

17:36 ἐξ] ἀπό *L* 158 *Tht*; *ex (gan)* Hipp *Georg.*^J 11,1; *inter (šoris)* Hipp *Georg.*^T 11,1

It is impossible to decide which Greek reading Hippolytus attests.

17:36 τίς] + ἐστίν *L* 158 318 554 *Ge*^{DOSJL} *Chr Tht Hipp Georg.* 11,1

The verb is required by the Georgian grammar.

17:45 σαβαωθ θεοῦ] *pr* θεοῦ 82*[vid] *CI s*^{-488.489} 29 244^{mg.}; > θεοῦ *O CII*^{-46'.313} 121 158* 245 707 *Georg Hipp Georg. Arm.* 13,2; *tr B* 46'-313 *a* 509 55 158^c 244^{txt} 460

The minus does not correspond to the MT, and, accordingly, in Hipp *Georg. Arm.* it is probably nothing more than freedom of quotation and/or translation.

17:48b הַיְּהוָה כִּי דִּיּוֹתִי תִּשְׁמַח וְהָיָה לְךָ שִׂמְחָה καὶ Δαυὶδ ἐτάχυνε καὶ ἔδραμε εἰς τὴν παράταξιν εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ ἀλλοφύλου *A O L C*^{-243txt} *d* 314 55 158 318 554 *Hipp Arm* § 89 (*cum v. l.*) = MT; > *B V* 243^{txt} *a b f s*⁻³¹⁴ 29 71 244 245 460 707; *sub ast* 127 243^{mg} = OG

ἔδραμε Hipp *Arm* § 89 (*cucurrit*)] ἐξήλθε καὶ αὐτός *L* 55 158 318 εἰς τὴν παράταξιν] *post* ἀλλοφύλου *tr* 125; > *O Hipp Arm* § 89

Hippolytus retains the, in all likelihood, older reading ἔδραμε with *A O C*^{-243txt} *d* 314 554 against ἐξήλθε καὶ αὐτός of the *L*-text, which seems to be recensional.³⁴ Agreement with *O* in omitting εἰς τὴν παράταξιν cannot be considered striking.

17:48b εἰς τὴν παράταξιν] *post* ἀλλοφύλου *tr* 125; > *O Hipp Arm* § 89

The agreement with *O* is likely only coincidental: Hippolytus abridges the text slightly in other instances as well.

17:49 τὸν ἀλλόφυλον ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτοῦ] *frontem alienigenae* Hipp *Arm.* § 89; *frontem eius* Hipp *Georg.* 15,1
ἔπεσεν Hipp *Arm.* § 89 (*cecidit*)] *dirutus est* Hipp *Georg.* 15,1

³⁴ The reading is included in Brock's list of lexical variants in *L. Brock, Recensions*, 273.

Again, the agreement with O is not striking.

καὶ ἐπάταξε τὸν ἀλλόφυλον καὶ ἐθανάτωσεν αὐτόν] > *O Hipp Arm* § 91
 Δαυίδ 2^ο] αὐτοῦ *O Hipp Arm* § 91

17:53 ἄνδρες] πᾶς 509; *fili*i Hipp *Georg.* 15,3 *Arm.* § 94

18:14 ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ / συνίων = MT] tr *L Chr Dav.* 1,3 *Tht I Reg*
569 *Sa Hipp Georg.* 4,6
ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ] *super totum Hipp Georg.* 4,6
κύριος] + παντοκράτωρ *L Georg*^{FO}; + ἦν *d 460 554 Hipp Georg.* 4,6 (*erat*)
= *Sixt*

³⁵ The Sahidic version has two words probably reflecting χορεύω and παίζω: *euhōs eusōbe*.

Hippolytus' quotation from 18:14 is best considered inexact: while the plus of the verb 'to be' may be added by the Georgian translator, *super totum* "over everything" is too far from "in all his ways" (NETS) to be an exact quotation or rendering. If this is the case, the agreement between Hippolytus and *L* in having the word "prudent" immediately after "David" could well be coincidental.

Appendix B: The Average Character Width in 4QSam^b

Full scale calculations of average character width in 4QSam^b would be beyond the scope of this study. Here are provided measurements of the character width on fragments 6 and 7 (using the photograph in DJD, plate XXIV). I did not measure all the spaces and the most frequently occurring letters (א, ה, ו, י, ל); the aim was to get a sufficiently low standard deviation / sample size ratio for most letters. The precision is 0.25 mm.

	Min	Max	Average	Range	Standard Deviation	Sample Size
א	2.00	2.75	2.25	0.75	0.29	16
ב	1.50	2.50	1.93	1.00	0.34	11
ג	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	1
ד	1.25	1.75	1.48	0.50	0.18	10
ה	2.25	2.75	2.35	0.50	0.17	10
ו	0.75	2.00	1.40	1.25	0.37	22
ז	1.25	1.25	1.25	0.00	0.00	1
ח	2.25	2.75	2.40	0.50	0.22	5
ט	2.00	3.00	2.50	1.00	0.50	3
י	1.00	1.75	1.47	0.75	0.28	15
כ	1.00	1.75	1.40	0.75	0.29	5
ך	1.25	1.75	1.50	0.50	0.18	5
ל	1.00	2.00	1.44	1.00	0.32	16
מ	1.75	2.50	2.04	0.75	0.31	14
ם	1.50	2.50	1.93	1.00	0.31	7
נ	1.00	1.75	1.25	0.75	0.25	7
ן	0.75	1.25	1.07	0.50	0.19	7
ס	—	—	—	—	—	0
ע	1.50	2.50	1.91	1.00	0.30	8
פ	1.50	1.75	1.63	0.25	0.18	2
ף	1.50	1.75	1.63	0.25	0.18	2
צ	2.00	2.75	2.38	0.75	0.32	4
ץ	1.75	2.00	1.88	0.25	0.18	2
ק	2.25	3.50	2.92	1.25	0.47	6
ר	1.00	1.75	1.14	0.75	0.28	7
ש	2.75	3.50	3.04	0.75	0.27	7
ת	1.75	3.00	2.27	1.25	0.35	13
Space	0.75	1.75	1.21	1.00	0.31	19
AVERAGE	1.56	2.27	1.88	0.70	0.26	8.33

Abbreviations

Non-Patristic Witnesses and Text-critical Signs

+	add(s)
–	<i>minus</i> ; the group of witnesses cited except for the MSS cited (e.g., s^{-130})
-	hyphen; combines those MSS that belong to the same group (e.g., 236-313)
>	omit(s) the lemma
*	the original reading of the MS (contrast c)
	separates the variation units within the same verse
1 ^o , 2 ^o etc.	first, second etc. occurrence of the same word within the verse in question
1 ^o ∩ 2 ^o	parablepsis from the first to the second occurrence of the same word within the verse in question
(1), (2) etc.	verse 1, 2 etc.
8HevXIIgr	The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever. Tov, E., <i>The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)</i> (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).
Ant	Fernández Marcos, N./Busto Saiz, J.R., <i>El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega</i> (3 vols; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1989–1996).
α'	Aquila's version
c	correction in the MS by another than the first hand (contrast *)
Compl	<i>Polyglotta Complutensis</i> ; cited when differs from MS 108 which it mainly follows.
Ge ^(DSOJ)	Georgian translation of the LXX; D, O etc.: MSS.
Göttingen	the LXX text according to <i>Septuaginta: Vetus testamentum graecum: Auctoritate Academiae scientiarum Göttingensis editum</i> (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931–).
h.t.	homoioteleuton
La ^M	Old Latin marginal readings according to Morano Rodríguez, C., <i>Glosas marginales de "vetus latina" en las biblias vulgatas españolas: 1–2 Samuel</i> (Textos y estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense 48; Madrid: Instituto de Filología C.S.I.C., 1989).
La ⁹³	Old Latin marginal readings according to Vercellone, C., <i>Variae Lectiones Vulgatae Latinae Bibliorum editionis, vol. 2</i> (Rome, 1864).

La ¹¹⁵	(Brooke-McLean: La ^b) Fifth century. Fischer, B./Ulrich, E.C./Sanderson, J.E., "Palimpsestus Vindobonensis: A Revised Edition of L 115 for Samuel-Kings", <i>BIOSCS</i> 16 (1983), 13–87. Contains text from the following verses in 1 Samuel: 1:14–2:15; 3:10–4:18; 6:3–17; 9:21–10:7; 10:16–11:13; 14:12–34.
La ¹¹⁶	(La ^q) Fifth century. Degering, H./Boeckler, A., <i>Die Quedlinburger Italafragmente</i> (Berlin, 1932). 1 Samuel 9:1–8; 15:10–18.
λ'	οἱ λοιποί (the rest of the translations = α' σ' θ')
mg	marginal reading (contrast txt)
MS(S)	manuscript(s)
MT	the Masoretic Text according to BHS
om	<i>omittit/omittunt</i> ; the witnesses cited omit the word(s) in question
pr	<i>praemittit/praemittunt</i> ; the witnesses cited place the reading before the lemma
Rahlfs	The LXX text according to Rahlfs, A., <i>Septuaginta</i> (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt/Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935).
rel	<i>reliqui</i> ; the rest of the witnesses, i.e., those that are not cited for the other readings in the variation unit in question
s nom	<i>sine nomine</i> (possibly Hexaplaric readings which bear no attribution)
Syh	Syrohexapla
Syr ^J	the Syriac version of Jacob of Edessa
sub ast	<i>sub asterisco</i> ; the reading is marked with an asterisk in the witness cited
σ'	Symmachus' version
tr	<i>transponit/transponunt</i> ; the witnesses cited change the word order. Ante/post ... tr: the witnesses move the word before/after the word mentioned
txt	the reading of the continuous text of the MS (contrast mg)
θ'	Theodotion's version
Vg.	The Vulgate according to Weber, R./Gryson, R., <i>Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem</i> (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994).
vid	<i>ut videtur</i> ; the witness seems to attest the reading for which it is cited

Greek Christian Authors

For the sake of completeness all the authors are mentioned here, even those whose names and/or works are not abbreviated. For the works published in PG, GCS, and SC only the series and volume are given.

Asterius Sophista

Comm. Ps. *Commentarii in Psalmos*. Richard, M., *Asterii sophistae commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt* (Symbolae Osloenses fasc. suppl. 16; Oslo: Brogger, 1956).

Bas = Basilius Magnus Caesariensis

Asc. *Asceticon magnum*. PG 31:901–1052.

Jejun. *De Jejunio*. PG 31:185–97.

Judic. *Prologus de iudicio Dei*. PG 31:653–76.

Chr = John Chrysostom

Anna *De Anna*. PG 54:631–76.

Dav. *De Davide et Saule*. PG 54:675–708.

Eclog. *Eclogae i-xlviii ex diversis homiliis*. PG 63:567–902.

Ep. Mon. *Epistula ad monachos*. Nicolopoulos, P.G., Αἱ εἰς τὸν Ἰωάννην τὸν Χρυσόστομον ἐσφαλμένως ἀποδιδόμεναι ἐπιστολαί (Athens: Tsiveriotes, 1973).

Exp. Ps. *Expositiones in Psalmos*. PG 55:39–498.

Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1 *In illud: Utinam sustineretis modicum*. PG 51:301–10.

Hom. Matt. *Homiliae in Matthaeum*. PG 57:13–472; 58:471–794.

Oppugn. *Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae*. PG 47:319–86.

Prod. Jud. *De prodicione Judae*. PG 49:373–92.

Cyril of Alexandria

Comm. Jo. *Commentarii in Joannem*. Pusey, P.E., *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium* (3 vols; Oxford: Clarendon, 1872 [repr. 1965]).

Didymus

Comm. Ps. *Commentarii in Psalmos*. Ps. 1–56: Doutreleau, L./Gesche, A./Gronewald, M., *Didymos der Blinde: Psalmenkommentar 1* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 7; Bonn: Habelt, 1969). Ps. 57–112: Gronewald, M., *Didymos der Blinde: Psalmenkommentar 2* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 4; Bonn: Habelt, 1968).

Fr. Ps. *Fragmenta in Psalmos*. Mühlenberg, E., *Psalmenkommentare aus der Katenenüberlieferung* (2 vols; *Patristische Texte und Studien* 16. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1977).

Eusebius

Hist. eccl. *Ecclesiastical History*. SC 31, 41, 55.

Hipp = Hippolytus

Comm. Dan. *Commentarium in Danielelem*. SC 14.

Dav. *De David et Goliath*. Garitte, CSCO 263, 264.

Arm. Armenian catena fragments of *Dav.* in *Mus* 76 and CSCO 263.

Georg. Georgian translation of *Dav.* in CSCO 263, reproduced in Latin in CSCO 264.

- Haer.* *Refutatio omnium haeresium*. Marcovich, M., *Hippolytus: Refutatio omnium haeresium* (*Patristische Texte und Studien* 25; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986).
- Noet.* *Contra haeresin Noeti*. Butterworth, R., *Hippolytus of Rome: Contra Noetum* (London: Heythrop College, 1977).
- Iren = Irenaeus
- Haer.* *Against Heresies*. Book 2: SC 294. Book 4: SC 100.
- Arm.* Armenian fragments of *Haer.* in SC 100.
- Lat.* Latin text of *Haer.* in SC 100.
- Or = Origen
- Fr. 1 Cor.* *Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam i ad Corinthios*. Jenkins, C., “Origen on 1 Corinthians”, *JTS* 9 (1908), 232–47, 353–72, 500–14; *JTS* 10 (1908), 29–51.
- Fr. 1 Reg.* *Fragmenta in librum primum Regnorum*. GCS 6:295–303.
- Hom. Jer.* *In Jeremiam*. SC 232.
- Comm. Jo.* *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis*. GCS 10:298–480.
- Mart.* *Exhortatio ad martyrium*. GCS 2:3–47.
- Or.* *De Oratione*. GCS 3:297–403.
- Sel. Ps.* *Selecta in Psalmos*. PG 12.
- Tht = Theodoret of Cyr
- Ep. Pauli* *Interpretatio in xiv epistulas sancti Pauli*. PG 82:36–877.
- Eran.* *Eranistes*. Ettlinger, G.H., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Eranistes* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975).
- 1 Reg.* *Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena*. Fernández Marcos, N./Busto Saiz, J.R., *Theodoreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena: editio critica* (Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 32; Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano”, 1984).
- Schol.* *Scholia in Reges*. Petit, F., *Autour de Théodoret de Cyr* (Louvain: Peeters, 2003).

Latin Christian Authors

For the works published in PL, CCSL, and CSEL only the series and volume are given. The sigla used in H. J. Frede’s *Kirchenschriftsteller: Verzeichnis und Sigel* are given for the author and the work. The datings are according to *Kirchenschriftsteller*.

Ambrose (AM)

- Exp. Luc.* (Lc) *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam*. Ca. 390 CE. CCSL 14:1–400.

- Exh. virginit.* (exh) *Exhortatio virginitatis*. 393/394 CE. Gori, F., *Sancti Ambrosii episcopi Mediolanensis opera* 14:2 (Milan/Rome, 1989).
- Ob. Theo.* (The) *De obitu Theodosii*. 395 CE. CSEL 73:371–401.
- Paen.* (pae) *De paenitentia*. Perhaps 388/390 CE. CSEL 73:119–206.
- Spir.* (sp) *De Spiritu Sancto*. 381 CE. CSEL 79:7–222.
- Virg.* (vg) *De virginibus*. 377 CE. Cazzaniga, E., *S. Ambrosii Mediolanensis episcopo De virginibus libri tres* (Corpus scriptorium latinorum paravianum; Turin: Paravia, 1948).
- Apponius (APO), *In Canticum Canticorum*. Late 6th cent. CCSL 19:1–311.
- Aug (AU) = Augustine
- Civ.* (ci) *De civitate Dei*. 412–426/7. CCSL 47, 48.
- Cresc.* (Cre) *Contra Cresconium Donatistam*. 405–406 CE. CCSL 52:325–582.
- Div. quæst. Simpl.* (q Si) *De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum*. 396/398 CE. CCSL 44.
- Ep.* (ep) *Epistulae*. CSEL 34, 44, 57, 58.
- C. Jul.* (Jul) *Contra Julianum*. 421/2 CE. PL 44:641–874.
- Leg.* (leg) *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum*. 420 CE. CCSL 49:35–131.
- Pecc. merit.* (pec) *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*. 411/2 CE. CSEL 60:3–151.
- Spec.* (spe) *De scriptura sancta speculum* (“*Quis ignorat*”). Ca. 427 CE. CSEL 12:3–285. Not to be confused with the non-Augustinian *Speculum* (CSEL 12:287–700).
- PsAug (PS-AU) = Pseudo-Augustine
- Fulg.* (Fu) *Libellus adversus Fulgentium Donatistam*. 430/450 CE. Lambot, C., *RB* 58 (1948), 190–222.
- Mirab.* (mir) *De mirabilibus S. Scripturae*. Ca. 655 CE. PL 35:2149–200
- Bed (Bed) = Venerable Bede
- Sam.* (Sam) *In primam partem Samuhelis libri 4*. Ca. 716 CE. CCSL 119:5–287.
- Benedict of Aniane (BEN-A)
- Concordia Regularum*. Before 821 CE. PL 103:423–1380.
- Brev. Goth.* (Brev. Goth.) *Breviarium Gothicum*. PL 86.
- Caesarius (CAE)
- Sermones* (s) Before 542 CE. CCSL 103, 104.
- Cassiodorus (CAr)
- Romans* (Rm) *Expositio in Epistulas S. Pauli*. Ca. 575. PL 68:413–686.
- Concilia Toletana* 16 (CO-Tol) Sixteenth council in 693 CE. Vives, J., *Concilios visigóticos e hispano-romanos*. Barcelona/Madrid, 1963.
- Cyp (CY) = Cyprian
- Demetr.* (Dem) *Ad Demetrianum*. 252/3 CE. CCSL 3A:35–51.
- Dom. or.* (or) *De dominica oratione* (*The Lord’s Prayer*). 250 CE. CCSL 3A:90–113.

- Eleem.* (op) *De opere et eleemosynis*. 253 CE. CCSL 3A:55–72.
Epistulae. (ep) CCSL 3B, 3C.
Fort. (Fo) *Ad Fortunatum*. 252/3 CE. CCSL 3:183–216.
Test. (te) *Ad Quirinum testimonia adversus Judaeos*. 248 or 250 CE. CCSL 3:3–179.
Unit. eccl. (un) *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate*. 251–256 CE. CCSL 3:249–68.
- PsCyp (PS-CY) = Pseudo-Cyprian
Ab. (ab) *De duodecim abusivis*. Ireland 630/50 CE. TU 34:1.
Novat. (Nov) *Ad Novatianum*. 253/257 CE. or later. CCSL 4:137–52.
- Euch (EUCH) = Eucherius
Comm. Reg. *Commentarii in libros Regum*. PL50:1047c–208c. Dubium.
Instructionum ad Salonium (inst). Between 428 and 434 CE. CSEL 31:65–161.
- Ferrandus (FEnd)
Epist. (ep) *Epistulae* 5–7. PL 67:910–50.
- Ferréol of Uzès (FEol)
Regula ad monachos. Between 553 and 573/81 CE. Desprez, V., *Revue Mabillon* 60 (1982), 124–48.
- Fulg (FU-M) = Fabius Planciades Fulgentius. Contemporary with Fulgentius of Ruspe (5th century) and perhaps the same person.
Aet. (aet) *De aetatibus mundi et hominis*. Helm, R., *Fabii Planciadis Fulgentii V. C. opera* (Leipzig, 1898), 129–79.
- Gildans Sapiens (GI)
De excidio et conquestu Britanniae ac flebili castigatione in reges principes et sacerdotes. Between ca. 515–530. Mommsen, T., *MG Auct. Antiquiss.* 13 (1898): 25–85.
- Glosa psalmorum ex traditione seniorum*. (AN Ps sen) Early 7th cent. Boese, H., *Anonymi glosa psalmorum ex traditione seniorum II* (AGLB 25; Fribourg: Herder, 1994).
- Gloss. Bibl.* = *Glossarium Biblicum* (AN glo B) Late 9th cent. MS Vat. Reg. lat 215 fol. 88–110. De Bruyne, D., *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 3 (1927), 113–20.
- Greg (GR-M) = Gregory the Great
Reg. (Rg) *In librum primum Regum expositionum libri 6*. 594/8 CE. CCSL 144:49–614.
- PsGreg (PS-GR-M) = Pseudo-Gregory
Concordia testimoniorum. (conc) Fransen, I. *RBén* 73 (1963), 247–73.
- Hesychius (HES)
In Leviticum. 430/450 CE., Latin trans. perhaps 6th cent. Wenger, A. *REAug* 2 (1956), 466–7.
- Hilary of Poitiers (HIL)
Collect. (col) *Collectanea Antiariana Parisina*. CSEL 65:43–187.
- Iren = Irenaeus; see Greek Fathers.
- Isid (IS) = Isidore of Sevilla

- 1 Reg. (Rg)* *Quaestiones in Vetus testamentum, 1 Regum*. After 624 CE. PL 83:207–424.
- Off. (off)* *De ecclesiasticis officiis (De origine officiorum)*. 598/615 CE. CCSL 113.
- Sententiarum*. (sent) 612/5 CE. PL 83:537–738.
- Isidore of Pelusium
Epistulae. PG 78.
- Jerome (HI)
Comm. Matt. (Mt) Commentariorum in Matthaeum libri IV. 398 CE. CCSL 77.
- Comm. Ps. (Ps) Commentarioli in Psalmos*. 401 CE. CCSL 78:3–352.
- Jov. (Jov)* *Adversus Iovinianum libri II*. 393 CE. PL 23:211–338.
- Epist. (ep)* *Epistulae*. Epistle 107 is dated to 400 CE. CSEL 55.
- Orig. Jer. Ezech. (Jr h; Ez h) Homiliae XXVIII in Jeremiam et Ezechielem Graeco Origenis Latine redditae*. 378/9 CE. GCS 6:1–194, 33:319–454.
- De viris illustribus*. (ill) 393 CE. Ceresa-Gastaldo, A., *Gli uomini illustri, De viris illustribus* (Florence, 1998).
- Lactantius (LAC)
Divinarum institutionum libri VII (The Divine Institutes). (in) 304/11 CE. CSEL 19:1–672.
- Luc (LUC) = Lucifer
Athan. (Ath) De Athanasio libri 2. 357/8 CE. CCSL 8:3–132.
- Parc. (par)* *De non parcendo in deum delinquentibus*. Ca. 359 CE. CCSL 8:195–261.
- Reg. (reg)* *De regibus apostaticis*. 357/8 CE. CCSL 8:135–61.
- Mutianus (MUT)
Chr. Hom. Heb. Chrysostomi Homiliae in epistulam ad Hebraeos. 6th cent. PG 63:13–236.
- Nemnius (NEM)
Hist. *Historia Brittonum*. Early 8th cent. Mommsen, T., *MG Auct. Antiquiss.* 13 (1898), 111–222.
- Optatus (OPT)
Contra Parmenianum Donatistam. (Par) Soon after 364 CE. CSEL 26:1–182.
- Pseudo-Philo (PS-PHo)
Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum. Perhaps 4th cent. SC 229.
- PsPel (PS-PEL) = Pseudo-Pelagius
De castitate. (Casp 6) 411/413 CE. PLSup 1:1464–505.
- De induratione cordis Pharaonis*. (ind) 404/5 or 430 CE. PLSup 1:1506–39.
- Pelagius II (PEL II.)
Epistulae 5,8 No dating is given by Frede; the author was pope 578–590. CE. Schwartz, E., *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* 4.2 (Strasbourg, 1914), 105–32.

Ruf (RUF) = Rufinus

Apol. Hier. (ap H) *Apologia adversus Hieronymum*. 401 CE. CCSL 20:37–123.

Greg. Orat. (Gr) *Gregorii Orationes*. Trans. 399/400 CE. CSEL 46.

Orig. Hom. Num. (Nm) *Origenis in Numeros homiliae*. Transl. 410 CE. GCS 30:3–285.

Orig. Princ. (pri) *Origenis Libri Peri archōn seu De principiis libri IV*. Transl. 398 CE. GCS 22.

Orig. Comm. Rom. (Rm) *Origenis Commentarius in epistulam ad Romanos*. Transl. 405/6 CE. Hammond Bammel, C.P., *Der Römerbrief-kommentar des Origenes: Kritische Ausgabe der Übersetzung Rufins* (AGLB 16; Freiburg, 1990).

Sedulius Scottus (SED-S)

In Matthaeum. (Mt) Löfstedt, B., *Sedulius Scottus: Kommentar zum Evangelium nach Matthäus* (2 vols; AGLB 14, 19; Freiburg, 1989, 1991).

Somn. Ner. = *Somnium Neronis*. (AP-E Nero) Dobschütz, E. von, “A Collection of Old Latin Bible Quotations: *Somnium Neronis*”, *JTS* 16 (1915), 12–27.

Spec. (PS-AU spe) = *De scriptura sancta speculum*. CSEL 12:287–700. Not to be confused with Augustine’s *Speculum* «*Quis ignorat*».

Tert (TE) = Tertullian

Fug. (fu) *De fuga in persecutione*. 208/9 CE. CCSL 2:1135–55.

Jejun. (je) *De jejunio adversus psychicos*. 210/11 CE. CCSL 2:1257–77.

Adv. Jud. (Jud) *Adversus Judaeos*. Perhaps 197 CE. CCSL 2:1339–96.

Marc. (Marc) *Against Marcion (Adversus Marcionem)*. Book 2: between 208 and 209 CE., book 4: 210–213 CE. SC 368, 456.

Paen. (pae) *De paenitentia*. Ca. 204 CE. SC 316.

Prax. (Pra) *Adversus Praxean*. 210/11 CE. SC 310.

Pud. (pud) *De pudicitia*. 210/11 CE. SC 394:144–280.

Scorp. (sco) *Scorpiace*. Ca. 211/12 CE. CCSL 2:1069–97.

Greek and Latin Classics

Aeschylus

Pers. *Persians*. Page, D.L., *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragodias* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).

Aristotle

Constitution of Athens. Oppermann, H., *Aristotelis Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1928 [repr. Stuttgart, 1968]).

Cicero

Epistulae ad familiares. Shackleton Bailey, D.R., *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae ad familiares libri I–XVI* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1988).

Orationes philippicae. Fedeli, P., *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta quae manserunt omnia: fasc. 28: M. Antonium orationes Philippicae XIV* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1986).

Demosthenes

In Neaeram. Rennie, W., *Demosthenis orationes*, vol. 3 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1931 [repr. 1960]).

Horace

Satires. Shackleton Bailey, D.R., *Q. Horati Flacci opera* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1985).

Josephus

Ant. *Jewish Antiquities*. Niese, B., *Flavii Iosephi opera* (4 vols; Berlin: Weidmann, 1885–1892 [repr. 1955]).

J.W. *Jewish War*. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi opera*.

Moeris

Atticista. Hansen, D.U., *Das Attizistische Lexikon des Moeris: Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker* 9 (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1998).

Plato

Apol. *Apology of Socrates*. Burnet, J., *Platonis opera* (5 vols; Oxford: Clarendon, 1900–1907).

Hipparch. *Hipparchus*. Burnet, *Platonis opera* 2.

Prot. *Protagoras*. Burnet, *Platonis opera* 3.

Resp. *Republic*. Burnet, *Platonis opera* 4.

Symp. *Symposium*. Burnet, *Platonis opera* 2.

Quintilian

Institutio oratoria. Radermacher, L., *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis orationis libri XII* (2 vols; Leipzig: Teubner, 1959).

Titus Livius (59 B.C.E – 17 CE.)

Ab urbe condita. Weissenborn, W./Müller, H.J., *Titus Livius: Ab urbe condita libri* (Berlin, 1962).

Seneca

De beneficiis. Hosius, C., *Seneca: De beneficiis libri VII: De clementia libri II* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1914).

De otio. Hermes, E., *L. Annaei Senecae Dialogorum libros XII: Annaei Senecae Opera quae supersunt: Vol. 1, fasc. 1* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1923).

Virgil

Aeneid. Ribbeck, O., *P. Vergili Maronis opera cum appendice* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1895).

Xenophon

Hellenica. Marchant, E.C., *Xenophontis opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1900 [repr. 1968]).

Secondary sources

AB	Anchor Bible
<i>AbrN</i>	<i>Abr-Nahrain</i>
ACW	Ancient Christian Writers
AGLB	<i>Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel</i> (= <i>Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel: Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel</i>). Freiburg: Herder, 1957–
<i>AJSL</i>	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature</i>
ANTF	Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
Belsheim	Belsheim, J., <i>Palimpsestus vindobonensis: Antiquissimae Veteris testamenti translationis latinae fragmenta</i> (Christianiae: 1885).
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BHS	Elliger, K./Rudolph, W. (ed.), <i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983).
<i>BIOSCS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
BiPa	Biblia patristica: index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1975–1987).
Brenton	Brenton, sir Lancelot C.L. (ed./trans.), <i>The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English</i> (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980).
Brooke-McLean	Brooke, A.E./McLean, N./Thackeray, H. St J., <i>The Old Testament in Greek</i> (3 vols; Cambridge: 1906–1940).
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca sacra</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum: Series latina. Turnhout, 1953–
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium
CSEL	Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
ESV	English Standard Version
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
Gesenius	Gesenius, W./Kautzsch, E./Bergsträsser, G., <i>Hebräische Grammatik</i> (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985).
<i>HALOT</i>	Koehler, L./Baumgartner, W./Stamm, J.J., <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> (4 vols; Leiden, 1994–1999).

- Hatch-Redpath Hatch, E./Redpath, H.A., *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books)* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon, 1897).
- HSM Harvard Semitic Monographs
- HUCA Hebrew Union College Annual
- ICC International Critical Commentary
- JETS *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
- JPJ *Journal of Progressive Judaism*
- KJV King James Version
- Lampe Lampe, G.W.H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961).
- LEH Lust, J./Eynikel, E./Hauspie, K., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996).
- Lewis-Short Lewis, C.T./Short, C./Freund, W. *Latin Dictionary Founded on Andrew's Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989).
- LSJ Liddell, H.G./Scott, R./Jones, H.S., *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed. with revised supplement; Oxford, 1996).
- MSU Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
- Muraoka Muraoka, T., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 2009).
- Mus *Muséon: Revue d'études orientales*
- NAB The New American Bible
- NASB The New American Standard Bible
- NET New English Translation
- NETS New English Translation of the Septuagint
- NJB New Jerusalem Bible
- NovT Novum Testamentum
- NovTSup Supplements to Novum Testamentum
- NRSV New Revised Standard Version
- NTTS New Testament Tools and Studies
- OCP *Orientalia christiana periodica*
- PG Migne, J.-P. (ed.), *Patrologia graeca* (162 vols; Paris, 1857–1886).
- PL Migne, J.-P. (ed.), *Patrologia latina* (217 vols; Paris, 1844–1864).
- PLSup Hamman, A. (ed.), *Patrologiae latinae supplementum* (5 vols; Paris, 1958–1974).
- RB *Revue biblique*
- Reider-Turner Reider, J./Turner, N., *An Index to Aquila* (VTSup 12; Leiden: Brill, 1966).
- REJ *Revue des études juives*
- ResQ *Restoration Quarterly*
- SacEr *Sacris erudiri: A Journal on the Inheritance of Early and Medieval Christianity*
- SBL Society of Biblical Literature

<i>SBLHS</i>	Alexander, P.H./Kutsko, J.F./Ernest, J.D./Decker-Lucke, S./Petersen, D.L., <i>The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies</i> (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SEAug	Studia ephemeridis Augustinianum
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
<i>STDJ</i>	<i>Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah</i>
StudOr	Studia orientalia
<i>TDOT</i>	Botterweck, G.J./Ringgren, H. (ed.)/Willis, J.T./Bromiley, G.W./Green, D.E. (trans.), <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> (8 vols; Grand Rapids, 1974–).
<i>TLG</i>	<i>Thesaurus linguae graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature</i>
Tov-Polak	Tov, E./Polak, F., <i>The Revised CATSS Hebrew/Greek Parallel Text</i> (2004).
TS	Texts and Studies
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum

Bibliography

Editions, Translations, and Reference Works

- Aland, K., *Vollständige Konkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament: unter Zugrundelegung aller modernen kritischen Textausgaben und des Textus receptus* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1983).
- Altgeorgisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* (ed. S. Sardshweladse/H. Fähnrich. Hamburg: Buske, 1999).
- Bedrossian, M., *New Dictionary: Armenian-English* (Venice: S. Lazarus Armenian Academy, 1875–79).
- Belsheim, J., *Palimpsestus vindobonensis: Antiquissimae Veteris testamenti translationis latinae fragmenta: E Commentariis theologicis (Theologisk Tidsskrift) separatim expressa* (Christianiae: 1885).
- Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (ed. K. Elliger/W. Rudolph; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983).
- Biblia patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique* (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1975–87).
- Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem* (ed. R. Weber/R. Gryson; 4th edn; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994).
- Blaise, A., *Manuel du latin chrétien* (Strasbourg, 1955).
- Bonwetsch, G.N., *Drei georgisch erhaltene Schriften von Hippolytus* (TU 26.1; 1904).
- Brockelmann, C., *Hebräische Syntax* (Neukirchen: Erziehungsvereinis, 1956).
- Brooke, A.E./McLean N./Thackeray, H.St.J., *The Old Testament in Greek: According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint* (3 vols; Cambridge: 1906–40).
- Buck, C.D., *Comparative grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933).
- Burnet, J., *Platonis opera* (5 vols; Oxford: Clarendon, 1900–07).

- Butterworth, R., *Hippolytus of Rome: Contra Noetum* (London: Heythrop College, 1977).
- Claesson, G., *Index Tertullianus* (3 vols; Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1974–75).
- Cross, F.M./Parry, D.W./Saley, R.J./Ulrich, E.C., *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel* (DJD XVII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005).
- Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library* (ed. T.H. Lim in consultation with P.S. Alexander; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).
- Degering, H./Boeckler, A., *Die Quedlinburger Italafragmente* (Berlin, 1932).
- Dobschütz, E. von, “A Collection of Old Latin Bible Quotations: Somnium Neronis”, *JTS* 16 (1915) 1–27.
- Doutreleau, L./Gesche A./Gronewald, M., *Didymos der Blinde: Psalmenkommentar 1: (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 7; Bonn: Habelt, 1969).*
- Ettlinger, G.H., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Eranistes* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975).
- Fedeli, P., *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta quae manserunt omnia: Fasc. 28: In M. Antonium orationes Philippicae XIV* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1986).
- Fernández Marcos, N./Busto Saiz, J.R., *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega* (3 vols; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1989–96).
- *Theodoreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena: editio critica* (Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 32; Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano,” 1984).
- Field, F., *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum vetus testamentum fragmenta* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon, 1867–75).
- Fincke, A., *The Samuel Scroll From Qumran: 4QSam^a Restored and Compared to the Septuagint and 4QSam^c* (STDJ 43; Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- Fischer, B./Ulrich, E.C./Sanderson, J.E., “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis: A Revised Edition of L 115 for Samuel-Kings”, *BIOSCS* 16 (1983) 13–87.
- Frede, H.J., *Kirchenschriftsteller: Verzeichnis und Siegel* (4th edn; Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel 1.1; Freiburg: Herder, 1995).
- Garitte, G., “Fragments arméniens du traité d’Hippolyte sur David et Goliath”, *Mus* 76 (1963) 277–318.
- *Traité d’Hippolyte sur David et Goliath, sur le Cantique des cantiques et sur l’Antéchrist: Version géorgienne* (CSCO 263–4: Scriptores Iberici, tomus 15–16; Leuven: Peeters, 1965).
- Gesenius, W./Kautzsch E./Bergsträsser, G., *Hebräische Grammatik* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985).

- Gronewald, M., *Didymos der Blinde: Psalmenkommentar 2 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 4)*; Bonn: Habelt, 1968).
- Hansen, D.U., *Das Attizistische Lexikon des Moeris (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 9)*; Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1998).
- Harvey, W.W., *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis libri quinque adversus haereses* (2 vols; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1857).
- Hatch, E./Redpath H.A., *A concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal books)* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon, 1897).
- Helm, R., *Fabii Planciadis Fulgentii V. C. opera* (Leipzig, 1898).
- Hermes, E., *L. Annaei Senecae Dialogorum libros XII (Annaei Senecae Opera quae supersunt 1.1)*; Leipzig: Teubner, 1923).
- Hosius, C., *Seneca: De beneficiis libri VII: De clementia libri II* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1914).
- Jenkins, C., "Origen on 1 Corinthians", *JTS* 9 (1908) 232–47, 353–72, 500–14; *JTS* 10 (1908) 29–51.
- Jenni, E., *Der hebräische Pi'el* (Zürich 1968).
- *Die hebräischen Präpositionen 3: Die Präposition Lamed* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000).
- Joüon, P., *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Trans. T. Muraoka; Subsidia biblica 14; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1996).
- Kannengiesser, C., *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis* (2 vols; *The Bible in Ancient Christianity* 1–2; Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Koehler, L./Baumgartner, W./Stamm, J.J., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Trans. and ed. M.E.J. Richardson; 4 vols; Leiden, 1994–99).
- Kopf, L., "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch", *VT* 8.2 (1958) 161–215.
- Lagarde, P. de, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum: pars prior* (Göttingen: Arnoldi Hoyer, 1883).
- Lampe, G.W.H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961).
- Lewis, C.T./Short, C./Freund, W., *Latin Dictionary Founded on Andrew's Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989).
- Liddell, H.G./Scott, R./Jones, H.S., *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th edn; Oxford, 1996).
- Lust, J./Eynikel, E./Hauspie, K., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996).

- Marchant, E.C., *Xenophontis opera omnia* (vol. 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1900 [repr. 1968]).
- Marcovich, M., *Hippolytus: Refutatio omnium haeresium* (*Patristische Texte und Studien* 25; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986).
- Miller, J./Hayes, J.H., *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (London: SCM, 1986).
- Morano Rodríguez, C., *Glosas marginales de "vetus latina" en las biblias vulgatas españolas: 1–2 Samuel* (Textos y estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense 48; Madrid: Instituto de Filología C.S.I.C., 1989).
- Moreschini, C., *Tertullien: Contre Marcion, tome V (Livre V)* (SC 483; Paris: Cerf, 2004).
- Moreschini, C./Braun, R., *Tertullien: Contre Marcion, tome IV (livre IV)* (SC 456; Paris: Cerf, 2001).
- Mühlenberg, E., *Psalmenkommentare aus der Katenenüberlieferung* (2 vols; *Patristische Texte und Studien* 16; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1977).
- Muraoka, T., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 2009).
- Niese, B., *Flavii Iosephi opera* (4 vols; Berlin: Weidmann, 1885–92 [repr. 1955]).
- Novum Testamentum Graece* (ed. K. Aland et al.; 27th revised edn; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1999).
- Oppermann, H., *Aristotelis Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1928 [repr. Stuttgart, 1968]).
- Petit, F., *Autour de Théodoret de Cyr* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003).
- Pusey, P.E., *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium* (3 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1872 [repr. 1965]).
- Radermacher, L., *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis oratiae libri XII* (2 vols; Leipzig: Teubner, 1959).
- Rahlfs, A., *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt / Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935).
- *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* (MSU 2; Berlin: Weidmann, 1914).
- *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments; Bd. I,1: Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (ed. D. Fraenkel; Supplement to *Septuaginta: Vetus testamentum graecum: Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

- Reider, J./Turner, N., *An Index to Aquila* (VTSup 12; Leiden: Brill, 1966).
- Rengstorff, K.H., *The Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus: Study Edition* (2 vols; Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Rennie, W., *Demosthenis orationes* (vol. 3; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931 [repr. 1960]).
- Ribbeck, O., *P. Vergili Maronis opera cum appendice* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1895).
- Richard, M., *Asterii sophistae commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt* (Symbolae Osloenses fasc. suppl. 16; Oslo: Brogger, 1956).
- Rousseau, A./Hemmerdinger, B./Doutreleau, L./Mercier, C., *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les Hérésies, livre IV, tome I: Introduction, notes justificatives, tables* (SC 100.1; Paris: Cerf, 1965).
- *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les Hérésies, livre IV, tome II: Texte et traduction.* (SC 100.2; Paris: Cerf, 1965).
- Rousseau, A. et al., *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les hérésies, livre I, tome II: Texte et traduction* (SC 264; Paris: Cerf, 1979).
- Septuaginta: Vetus testamentum graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931–
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R., *Q. Horati Flacci opera* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1985).
- *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae ad familiares libri I–XVI* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1988).
- Ter-Minassiantz, E., *Irenaeus: Gegen die Häretiker: Elenchos kai anatropē tēs pseudōnymou gnōseōs: Buch IV u. V: In armenischen Version entdeckt von Lic. Dr. Karapet Ter-Mëkërttschian* (TU 35.2; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1910).
- The Greek New Testament* (ed. B. Aland/K.Aland/J. Karavidopoulos/C.M. Martini/B.M. Metzger; 4th edn; London: United Bible Societies, 1993).
- The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (ed. and trans. Sir Lancelot C. L. Brenton; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980).
- Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (ed. G.J. Botterweck/H. Ringgren; trans. J.T. Willis/G.W. Bromiley/D.E. Green; 8 vols; Grand Rapids, 1974–).
- Thesaurus linguae graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature* (Online: <http://www.tlg.uci.edu>).
- Thesaurus Sancti Cypriani* (Corpus Christianorum / Thesaurus Patrum Latinorum; Turnhout: Brepols, 1997).
- Tov, E., *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

- Tov, E./Polak, F., *The Revised CATSS Hebrew/Greek Parallel Text* (2004).
- Unger, D.J./Dillon, J.J. (trans.), *St. Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies. Translated and Annotated by Dominic J. Unger with Further Revisions by John J. Dillon* (ACW 55; New York / Mahwah, 1992).
- Vetus Latina Database* (Beuron; online: <http://www.brepolis.net>).
- Weissenborn, W./Müller, H.J., *Titus Livius: Ab urbe condita* (Berlin, 1962).
- Westcott, B.F./Hort, F.J.A., *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction* (Cambridge, 1882).
- Whiston, W. (trans.), *The Wars of the Jews by Flavius Josephus* (London: Dent, 1928).
- *The Works of Flavius Josephus* (1895).
- Vercellone, C., *Variae Lectiones Vulgatae Latinae Bibliorum editionis: vol. 2* (Rome, 1864).

Studies

- Aejmelaeus, Anneli, “A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek—Deconstructing the *Textus Receptus*”, in A. Voitila/J. Jokiranta (ed.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (FS Sollamo; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 353–66.
- “Corruption or Correction? Textual Development in the MT of 1 Samuel 1”, in P. Torijano Morales/A. Piquer Otero (ed.), *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls: Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera: Florilegium Complutense* (SJSJ 157; Leiden: Brill, 2012).
- “Hannah’s Psalm: Text, Composition, and Redaction”, in J. Pakkala/M. Nissinen (ed.), *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 95; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008) 354–376.
- *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (CBET 50; Leuven: Peeters, 2007).
- “Licence to Kill? Deut 13:10 and the Prerequisites of Textual Criticism”, in *On the Trail*, 181–204. Original print: H. Juusola/J. Laulajainen/H. Palva (ed.), *Verbum et Calamus: Semitic and Related Studies in Honour of the Sixtieth Birthday of Professor Tapani Harviainen* (StudOr 99; Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 2004) 1–22.

- “The Septuagint of 1 Samuel”, in *On the Trail*, 123–141. Original print: *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (Kampen: Kok, 1993) 131–149.
- “What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint”, in *On the Trail*, 71–106. Original print: *ZAW* 99 (1987) 55–89.
- Aland, K. (ed.), *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare* (ANTF 5; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972).
- Aland, K./Aland, B., *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (Trans. E.F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987).
- Albright, W.F., “New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible”, *BASOR* 140 (1955) 27–33. Reprint in F.M. Cross/S. Talmon (ed.), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975) 140–146.
- Barthélemy, D., “A Reexamination of the Textual Problems in 2 Sam 11:2 –1 Kings 2:11 in the Light of Certain Criticism of *Les Devanciers d’Aquila*”, in R.A. Kraft (ed.), *1972 Proceedings: Septuagint and Pseudepigrapha Seminars* (SBLSCS 2; Missoula: SBL, 1972) 16–89.
- *Les Devanciers d’Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophète: trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d’une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l’influence du rabbinat palestinien* (VTSup 10, Leiden: Brill, 1963).
- Begg, C.T., “David’s Double Escape according to Josephus”, *JPJ* 10 (1998) 28–45.
- “David’s Fourfold Escape according to Josephus”, *Antonianum* 80:3 (2005) 433–452.
- “David, Object of Hate and Love according to Josephus”, *REJ* 166:3–4 (2007) 395–410.
- “David’s Second Sparing of Saul according to Josephus”, *TynBul* 48:1 (1997) 93–117.
- “Samuel’s Farewell Discourse according to Josephus”, *SJOT* 11:1 (1997) 56–77.
- “Saul’s Royal Start according to Josephus”, *SacEr* 37 (1997) 5–32.
- “The Youth of Samuel according to Josephus”, *SacEr* 45 (2006) 15–45.
- Brock, S.P., “Lucian Redivivus: Some Reflections on Barthélemy’s *Les Devanciers d’Aquila*”, in *Studia Evangelica* 5 (TU 103; Berlin, 1968) 176–181.
- *The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel* (Quaderni di Henoch 9; Turin: Silvio Zamorani, 1996).

- Burkitt, F.C., *The Old Latin and the Itala* (TS 4,3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896).
- Busto Saiz, J.R., "On the Lucianic manuscripts in 1–2 Kings", in C.E. Cox (ed.), *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem, 1986* (SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 305–311.
- "The Antiochene Text in 2 Samuel 22", in L. Greenspoon/O. Munnich, *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Paris 1992* (SBLSCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995) 131–152.
- Cerrato, J.A., *Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus* (Oxford Theological Monographs; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Chapman, J., "Did the Translator of St Irenaeus Use a Latin N.T.?", *RB* 36 (1924) 34–51.
- Cross, F.M., "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint", *BASOR* 132 (1953) 15–26.
- "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert", *HTR* 57 (1964) 281–299.
- Cross, F.M./R.J. Saley, "A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel^a (4Q51)", *DSD* 13,1 (2006) 46–54.
- Cross, F.M./S. Talmon (ed.), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975).
- De Boer, P.A.H., *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel I–XVI: A Contribution to the Study of the Books of Samuel* (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1938).
- Driver, S.R., *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (2nd edn; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913).
- Dunbar, D., "The Problem of Hippolytus of Rome: A Study in Historical-Critical Reconstruction", *JETS* 25:1 (1982) 63–74.
- Döllinger, J.J.I. von, *Hippolytus und Kallistus, oder die römische Kirche in der ersten Hälfte des dritten Jahrhunderts* (Regensburg: Joseph Manz, 1853).
- Elliot, J.K., "Rational Criticism and the Text of the New Testament", *Theology* 75 (1972) 338–43.
- Epp, E.J., *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays, 1962–2004* (NovTSup 116; Leiden: Brill, 2005).
- "Issues in the New Testament Textual Criticism: Moving from the Nineteenth Century to the Twenty-First Century", in *Perspectives*, 641–97.

- Original print: D.A. Black (ed.), *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.) 17–76.
- “It's All about Variants: A Variant-Conscious Approach to New Testament Textual Criticism”, *HTR* 100:3 (2007) 275–308.
- “Toward the Clarification of the Term ‘Textual Variant’”, in J.K. Elliot, *Studies in New Testament Language and Text* (NovTSup 44; Leiden: Brill, 1976) 153–173.
- Fee, G.D., “Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism – Which?”, in J.K. Elliot, *Studies in New Testament Language and Text* (NovTSup 44; Leiden: Brill, 1976) 174–197.
- Feldman, L.H. “Josephus’ Portrait of David”, *HUCA* 60 (1989) 129–174.
- “Josephus’ Portrait of Samuel”, *AbrN* 30 (1992) 103–145.
- “Josephus’ Portrait of Saul”, *HUCA* 53 (1982) 45–99.
- *Josephus and Modern Scholarship* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984).
- Fernández Marcos, N., “A Greek-Hebrew Index of the Antiochene Text”, in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Oslo, 1998* (SBLSCS 51; Atlanta: SBL, 2001) 301–317.
- “Literary and Editorial Features of the Antiochian Text in Kings”, in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 287–304.
- “On the Present State of Septuagint Research in Spain”, in N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *La Septuaginta en la Investigacion Contemporanea: V Congreso de la IOSCS* (Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 34; Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano”, 1985) 271–85.
- “Prólogo” to S.P. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of I Samuel* (Quaderni di Henoch 9; Turin: Silvio Zamorani, 1996).
- *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Fischer, B., “Limitations of Latin in Representing Greek”, in B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977) 362–74.
- “Lukian-Lesarten in der Vetus-Latina der vier Königsbücher”, *Studia Anselmiana* 27/28 (1951) 169–77.
- Frickel, J., “Ippolito di Roma, scrittore e martire”, in *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito* (SEAug 30; Rome: Institutum patristicum “Augustinianum”, 1989) 23–41.

- Graetz, H., *Geschichte der Juden 1* (Leipzig, 1874).
- Gordon, R.P., "The Problem of Haplography in 1 and 2 Samuel", in G.J. Brooke/B. Lindars, *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writing* (SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 131–58.
- Hanhart, R., "Ursprünglicher Septuagintatext und lukianische Rezension des 2. Esrabuches im Verhältnis zur Textform der Vetus Latina", in R. Gryson (ed.), *Philologia sacra: Biblische und patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele zu ihrem siebzigsten Geburtstag* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993) 90–115.
- Harnack, A. von, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (2nd edn; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985).
- Hedley, P.L., "The Göttingen Investigation and Edition of the Septuagint", *HTR* 26 (1933) 57–72.
- Herbert, E.D., *Reconstructing Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Method Applied to the Reconstruction of 4QSam^a* (STDJ 22; Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- "4QSam^a and Its Relationship to the LXX: An Exploration in Stemmatological Analysis", in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Cambridge, 1995* (SBLSCS 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 37–55.
- Higgins, A.J.B., "The Latin Text of Luke in Marcion and Tertullian", *VC* 5,1 (1951) 1–42.
- Howard, G., "The Septuagint: A Review of Recent Studies", *ResQ* 13 (1970) 154–164.
- Hutzli, J., *Die Erzählung von Hanna und Samuel: textkritische und literarische Analyse von 1. Samuel 1–2 unter Berücksichtigung des Kontextes* (ATANT 89; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2007).
- Janzen, J.G., *Studies in the text of Jeremiah* (HSM 6; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973).
- Jellicoe, S., *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays* (Library of Biblical Studies; New York: Ktav, 1974).
- *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968).
- Jobs, K.H./Silva, M., *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2000).
- Johnson, B., *Die hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta* (Studia Theologica Lundensia 22; Lund: Håkan Ohlssons).
- Jordan, H., "Das Alter und die Herkunft der lateinischen Übersetzung des Hauptwerkes des Irenaeus", in *Theologische Studien: Theodor Zahn dargebracht* (Leipzig, 1908) 133–92.

- Kauhanen, T., "Irenaeus and the Text of 1 Samuel", *VT* 59.3 (2009) 415–28.
- "Traces of the Proto-Lucianic Text", *BIOSCS* 40 (2007) 75–87.
- Kilpatrick, G.D., "Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament", in J. Blinzler, (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963) 125–37.
- Kim, J.-H., *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königebücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1–19,9* (BZAW 394; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009).
- Klein, R.W., "New Evidence for an Old Recension of Reigns", *HTR* 60 (1967) 93–105.
- "Studies in the Greek Texts of the Chronicler" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1966).
- *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: From the Septuagint to Qumran* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974).
- Koch, H., *Cyprianische Untersuchungen* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 4; Bonn: Marcus und Weber, 1926).
- Kraft, R.A., "Reassessing the Impact of Barthélemy's *Devanciers*, Forty Years Later", *BIOSCS* 37 (2004) 1–28.
- Kreuzer, S. "Towards the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (Especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and Kaige Recension)", in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SBLSCS 55; Atlanta: SBL, 2008) 239–53.
- "Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, *Kaige*, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns," *BIOSCS* 42 (2009) 34–51.
- Law, T.M./Kauhanen, T., "Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer", *BIOSCS* 43 (2010) 73–87.
- Liljeström, M., "Looking for Fragments of the Syrohexapla: The Song of Hannah in Barberiniani Orientali 2 as a Test Case", *BIOSCS* 40 (2007) 49–61.
- Loi, V., "L' identità letteraria di Ippolito di Roma", in *Ricerche su Ippolito* (SEAug 13; Rome: Institutum patristicum "Augustinianum", 1977) 67–88.
- Lundström, S. *Studien zur lateinischen Irenäusübersetzung* (Lund: Ohlsson, 1943).
- *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der Christlichen Latinität* (Lund: Gleerup, 1955).

- Metzger, B.M., *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977).
- “The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible”, in *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (NTTS 4; Leiden: Brill, 1963) 1–41.
- Mez, A., *Die Bibel des Josephus: Untersucht für Buch V–VII der Archäologie* (Basel: Jaeger & Kober, 1895).
- Morrison, C.E., *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 11; Boston: Brill, 2001).
- Mühlenberg, E., “Zur Überlieferung des Psalmenkommentars von Origenes”, in Jürgen Dummer (ed.), *Texte und Textkritik: Eine Aufsatzsammlung* (TU 133; Berlin, 1987) 441–51.
- Nautin, P., *Hippolyte et Josipe: contribution a l’histoire de la littérature chrétienne du troisième siècle* (Études et textes pour l’histoire du dogme de la Trinité 1; Paris: Cerf, 1947).
- Nodet, E., “Josephus and the Books of Samuel”, in S.J.D. Cohen/J.J. Schwartz (ed.), *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism: Louis H. Feldman Jubilee Volume* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 67; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 141–67.
- Nuove ricerche su Ippolito* (SEAug 30; Rome: Institutum patristicum “Augustinianum”, 1989).
- O’Connell, K.G., *The Theodotionic Revision of the Book of Exodus: A Contribution to the Study of the Early History of the Transmission of the Old Testament in Greek* (HSM 3; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972).
- Osburn, C., “Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism”, *NovT* 47.4 (2005) 313–43.
- Parry, D.W., “Hannah in the Presence of the Lord”, in P. Hugo/A. Schenker (ed.), *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010) 53–73.
- Petzer, J.H., “Eclecticism and the Text of the New Testament”, in J.H. Petzer/P.J. Hartin (ed.), *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS 15; Leiden: Brill, 1991) 47–62.
- Pietersma, A., “Proto-Lucian and the Greek Psalter”, *VT* 28.1 (1978) 66–72.
- Polak, F.H., “Statistics and Textual Filiation: The Case of 4QSam^a/LXX (with a note on the text of the Pentateuch)”, in *Septuagint, scrolls and cognate writings* (SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 215–76.
- Preuss, H.D., “חֹהַּ *hwh*; הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה *histach^avāh*”, in *TDOT* 4, 248–56.

- Purvis, J.D., *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968).
- Rahlfs, Alfred. *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher. Septuaginta-Studien 3* (2nd edn; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965).
- Reynders, B. (ed.), *Lexique comparé du texte grec et des versions latine, arménienne et syriaque de l' "Adversus haereses" de Saint Irénée I: Introduction: Index des mots grecs, arméniens et syriaques* (CSCO 141, Subsidia, tome 5; Louvain, 1963).
- *Lexique comparé du texte grec et des versions latine, arménienne et syriaque de l' "Adversus haereses" de Saint Irénée II: Index des mots latins* (CSCO 142; Subsidia, tome 6. Louvain, 1963).
- Ricerche su Ippolito* (SEAug 13; Rome: Institutum patristicum "Augustinianum", 1977).
- Rondeau, M.-J., "Le commentaire sur les Psaumes d'Evagre le Pontique", *OCP* 26 (1960) 307–48.
- Roth, D.T., "Did Tertullian Possess a Greek Copy or Latin Translation of Marcion's Gospel?" *VC* 63.5 (2009) 429–67.
- Saley, R.J., "Greek Lucianic Doublets and 4QSam^a", *BIOSCS* 40 (2007) 63–73.
- "Proto-Lucian and 4QSam^a", *BIOSCS* 41 (2008) 34–45.
- *The Samuel Manuscript of Jacob of Edessa: A Study in Its Underlying Textual Traditions* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 9; Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- "The Textual Vorlagen for Jacob of Edessa's Revision of the Books of Samuel", in B. ter Haar Romeny (ed.), *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of His Day* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 18; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 113–25.
- Salvesen, A., "Jacob of Edessa's Version of 1–2 Samuel: Its Method and Text-Critical Value", in B. ter Haar Romeny (ed.), *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of His Day* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 18; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 127–44.
- Sanday, W., "The Date of the Latin Irenaeus: A Fragment", in W. Sanday/C.H. Turner *Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923) lvii–lxiv.
- Schmid, U., *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einnordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe* (ANTF 25; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995).
- Shenkel, J.D., "A Comparative Study of the Synoptic Parallels in I Paraleipomena and I–II Reigns", *HTR* 62 (1969) 63–85.

- *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM 1; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968).
- Simonetti, M., “A modo di conclusione: una ipotesi di lavoro”, in *Ricerche su Ippolito* (SEAug 13; Rome: Institutum patristicum “Augustinianum”, 1977) 151–56.
- “Aggiornamento su Ippolito”, in *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito* (SEAug 30; Rome: Institutum patristicum “Augustinianum”, 1989) 75–130.
- Skehan, P.W., “Turning or Burning? 1 Sam 17:53 LXX”, *CBQ* 38 (1976) 193–5.
- Soden, H. von., “Der lateinische Paulustext bei Marcion und Tertullian”, in *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag 26. Januar 1927* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1927).
- Soisalon-Soininen, I., *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (AASF B 132.1; Helsinki, 1965).
- Sollamo, R., “Translation Technique as a Method”, in H. Ausloos et al. (ed.), *Translating a Translation: The LXX and its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2008) 35–41.
- Souter, A., “The Date and Place of the Latin Translation of Irenaeus”, in W. Sanday/C.H. Turner (ed.), *Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923) lxxv–cxi.
- “The New Testament Text of Irenaeus”, in W. Sanday/C.H. Turner (ed.), *Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923) cxii–clxix.
- Spottorno, V., “Josephus’ Text for 1–2 Kings (3–4 Kingdoms)”, in L. Green-spoon/O. Munnich, *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Paris 1992* (SBLSCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995) 145–52.
- “Some Remarks on Josephus’ Biblical Text for 1–2Kgs”, in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 277–85.
- “The Books of Chronicles in Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*”, in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SBLSCS 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 381–90.
- “The Lucianic Text of Kings in the New Testament”, in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SBLSCS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991) 279–84.
- Stockmayer, T., “Hat Lukian zu seiner Septuagintarevision die Peschito benützt”, *ZAW* 12 (1892) 218–23.

- Talmon, S., "The Textual Study of the Bible – A New Outlook", in F.M. Cross/S. Talmon (ed.), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975) 321–400.
- Taylor, B.A., *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns* (HSM 50–51; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).
- "The Lucianic Text of 1 Reigns: The Three Texts Compared and Contrasted", *BIOSCS* 29 (1996) 53–66.
- Thackeray, H.St.J., *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1929).
- "Note on the evidence of Josephus", Brooke-McLean 2.1, ix.
- Tov, E., "Lucian and Proto-Lucian: Toward a New Solution of the Problem", *RB* 79 (1972) 101–13.
- *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd rev. edn; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).
- "The State of the Question: Problems and Proposed Solutions", in R.A. Kraft (ed.), *1972 Proceedings for IOSCS and the SBL Pseudepigrapha Seminar* (SBLSCS 2; Missoula, 1972) 3–15.
- *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3; Jerusalem: Simor, 1981).
- "The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam^a", *JSOT* 14 (1979) 37–53.
- Trebolle Barrera, J., *Centena in libros Samuelis et Regum: Variantes textuales y composición literaria en los libros de Samuel y Reyes* (Textos y estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense 47; Madrid: Instituto de Filología C.S.I.C., 1989).
- Turner, C.H., "Preface" to W.Sanday/C.H. Turner, *Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923).
- Ulrich, E., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).
- "Characteristics and Limitations of the Old Latin Translation of the Septuagint", in *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 275–89.
- "The Old Latin Translation of the LXX and the Hebrew Scrolls from Qumran", in *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 233–74.
- *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978).
- VanderKam, J.C., *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).

- Voogd, H., "A Critical and Comparative Study of the Old Latin Texts of the First Book of Samuel" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1947; Microfilm: University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, 1972).
- Walters, P., *The Text of the Septuagint* (ed. D.W. Gooding; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
- Wiener, H.M., "The Pentateuchal Text: A Reply to Dr. Skinner", *BSac* 71 (1914) 218–68.
- Ziegler, J., *Der Bibeltext im Daniel-Kommentar des Hippolyt von Rom* (Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen i. philologisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1952, Nr. 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952).
- Östrup, J., *Orientalische Höflichkeit* (Leipzig 1929).

Commentaries

- Campbell, A.F., *I Samuel* (FOTL 7; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).
- Cogan, M./Tadmor, H., *II Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 11; New York: Doubleday, 1988).
- Dahood, M., *Psalms I* (AB 16; New Haven, 1965/2006).
- McCarter, P.K., *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 8; 1st edn; Garden City: Doubleday, 1980).
- Montgomery, J.A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Kings* (ed. H.S. Gehman; ICC; Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1986).
- Smith, H.P., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Books of Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1979).
- Thenius, O., *Die Bücher Samuelis* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1842).
- Wellhausen, J., *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871).

Abstract

Tuukka Kauhanen

The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel

The Lucianic text of the Septuagint of the Historical Books – witnessed primarily by the manuscript group *L* (19, 82, 93, 108, and 127) – consists of at least two strata: the recensional elements, which date back to about 300 CE, and the substratum under these recensional elements, the proto-Lucianic text. Some distinctive readings in *L* seem to be supported by witnesses that antedate the supposed time of the recension. These witnesses include the biblical quotations of Josephus, Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian, and the Old Latin translation of the Septuagint. It has also been posited that some Lucianic readings might go back to Hebrew readings that are not found in the Masoretic text but appear in the Qumran biblical texts. This phenomenon constitutes the proto-Lucianic problem.

In chapter 1 the proto-Lucianic problem and its research history are introduced. Josephus' references to 1 Samuel are analyzed in chapter 2. His agreements with *L* are few and are mostly only apparent or, at best, coincidental.

In chapters 3–6 the quotations by four early church fathers are analyzed. Hippolytus' Septuagint text is extremely hard to establish since his quotations from 1 Samuel have only been preserved in Armenian and Georgian translations. Most of the suggested agreements between Hippolytus and *L* are only apparent or coincidental. Irenaeus is the most trustworthy textual witness of the four early church fathers. His quotations from 1 Samuel agree with *L* several times against *codex Vaticanus* (B) and all or most of the other witnesses in preserving the original text. Tertullian and Cyprian agree with *L* in attesting some Hebraizing approximations that do not seem to be of Hexaplaric origin. The question is more likely of early Hebraizing readings of the same tradition as the καίγε recension.

In chapter 7 it is noted that Origen, although a pre-Lucianic Father, does not qualify as a proto-Lucianic witness.

General observations about the Old Latin witnesses as well as an analysis of the manuscript La¹¹⁵ are given in chapter 8. In chapter 9 the theory of “the proto-Lucianic recension” is discussed. In order to demonstrate the existence of the proto-Lucianic recension one should find instances of indisputable agreement between the Qumran biblical manuscripts and *L* in readings that are sec-

ondary in Greek. No such case can be found in the Qumran material in 1 Samuel.

In the text-historical conclusions (chapter 10) it is noted that of all the suggested proto-Lucianic agreements in 1 Samuel (about 75 plus 70 in La¹¹⁵) more than half are only apparent or, at best, coincidental. Of the indisputable agreements, however, 26 are agreements in the original reading. In about 20 instances the agreement is in a secondary reading. These agreements are early variants; mostly minor changes that happen all the time in the course of transmission. Four of the agreements, however, are in a pre-Hexaplaric Hebraizing approximation that has found its way independently into the pre-Lucianic witnesses and the Lucianic recension.

The study aims at demonstrating the value of the Lucianic text as a textual witness: under the recensional layer(s) there is an ancient text that preserves very old, even original readings which have not been preserved in B and most of the other witnesses. The study also confirms the value of the early church fathers as textual witnesses.